

The
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. IV.

JULY, 1898.

No. 3.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church; a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRESS OF
STORMONT & JACKSON,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

C

Vo

da

ph

Ge

wa

br

aff

an

re

fr

un

ac

th

th

w

g

cu

er

P

M

b

c

t

THE
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. IV.

JULY, 1898.

No. 3.

GERBERT—POPE AND PHILOSOPHER.¹

In an age which Baronius characterizes as *iron, leaden dark*,² one figure stood conspicuous in the world of letters and philosophy, as well as in the world of religion and politics. Gerbert (Sylvester II) was in the tenth century what Erigena was in the ninth and what Abélard was in the twelfth. Yet, brilliant as was his career, identified as he was with public affairs, his striking personality was almost buried under legend and fable, when modern scholarship removed the mass of misrepresentation and revealed to us the simple grandeur of a life free from the slightest suggestion of the uncanny. Failing to understand him, yet feeling dimly the greatness of his character, the contemporaries of Gerbert attributed his success to the study of necromancy, and even hinted at a compact with the evil one. Benno, adherent of the anti-pope Guibert, writing at the end of the eleventh century, was the first to give definite form to the dark rumors that were afloat, by accusing Sylvester II of obtaining the papacy through the influence of magic art and by compact with Satan. Martinus Polonus, St. Antonine, Vincent of Beauvais and William of Malmesbury repeated the fable; the Centuriators of Magdeburg gave it new lease of life, and the first Reformers made capital for controversy out of every silly story connected with the name of Sylvester.

¹ Gerbert, *Un Pape Philosophe*, par F. Picavet, Paris, 1897.

² *Annales*, ad annum 900.

The Letters of Gerbert, published in 1611 by Masson, and in 1636 by Duchesne, should have shown the writer in his true character. Richer's Histories, long neglected by students of the ninth century, but published towards the middle of the present century by Pertz in the "*Monumenta Germaniæ*," giving us, as they do, the straightforward account of a contemporary historian, should have silenced the voice of schismatic, reformer and Gallican. But great is the power of historical misrepresentation. Despite the publication of documents so decisive, despite the learned works of Mabillon,¹ Muratori² and the more recent studies by Olleris³ and Havet,⁴ readers of general history, as well as students of the history of philosophy, still cling to the traditional idea of Gerbert, as presented in Victor Hugo's verse :

Gerbert, l'âme livrée aux sombres aventures.

The work before us, the ninth volume published by the Religious Section of the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes*, is a valuable contribution, both in matter and in method, to the history of mediæval philosophy. The author bases his narrative on trustworthy contemporary sources, and is accurate as to facts; so that where his judgment is at fault, his references assist the more careful student in verifying and correcting.

To one who has read this volume and has been led by its perusal to study the letters and works of Gerbert, it is clear that the key to the many-sided character of the philosopher-pope is his devotion to philosophy. As monk, teacher, abbot, archbishop and pope, he exhibited talents most varied, but his peculiar concept of philosophy and his devotion to the realization of that concept constitute the centre toward which all the qualities of his mind converge and in which many of the apparent inconsistencies of his actions vanish. Philosophy was for him "the science of things human and divine"; it was co-extensive with knowledge. A philosopher, according to his notion, is one versed in all the known branches of science. Grammar, rhetoric and music belong to the art of expression, but all that is theoretical—mathematics, astronomy, physics, the theory

¹ *Annales Ord. S. Bened.* II, p. 241. &c.

² *Rerum Ital. Scriptores.*

³ *Œuvres de Gerbert*, Paris, 1867.

⁴ *Lettres de Gerbert*, 1889.

of politics—must be included under the name of philosophy. Erudition, therefore, is as essential a requisite in the philosopher as is a synthetic grasp of the principles which underlie all the departments of knowledge, and dominate every department of being. While yet a monk at Aurillac, Gerbert was distinguished among his fellow-students by that *industria* which his papal patron admired; the same *industria* characterized him as master of the cathedral school at Rheims. As teacher, he was indefatigable in his search after knowledge, and his letters show with what perseverance he sought out manuscript copies of the works of pagan and Christian writers. In order to secure a volume which is needed in the library of the school, he begs, he pleads, he flatters, he promises favors; in a word, he resorts to every expedient. Never, not even in the days of the pagan renaissance in Italy, was there a more enthusiastic book-hunter. When he became abbot of Bobbio his zeal for knowledge did not abate. The letters which belong to that period of his life betray his anxiety for the preservation and increase of the cloister library, and it is not at all improbable that the catalogue of the library of Bobbio,¹ so valuable as a guide to the literature of the ninth and tenth centuries, is a description of the wealth of ancient learning amassed by Gerbert. Indeed, Olleris conjectures that the famous Catalogue was prepared by the industrious abbot himself. Gerbert's friends, it would seem, were well aware of his zeal in this regard. "You know," he writes, "with what great eagerness (*quanto studio*) I search everywhere for copies of books."²

All this is interesting as an indication of the personal character of the man; it is still more interesting as illustrative of his concept of philosophy. Gerbert was not unacquainted with Erigena's work, *De Divisione Naturae*, and, like Erigena, he conceives philosophy as comprehending all branches of speculative knowledge. Not for two centuries more will the domain of theology be staked off from the region of philosophy; not till the inauguration of the modern scientific movement will the several sciences receive their autonomy—an autonomy which has had its disadvantages as well as its advantages.

¹ Muratori, *Antiq. Ital. Medii Aevi* III, col. 897.

² Letter 130, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* CXXXIX col. 233.

With what singleness of purpose Gerbert devoted himself to the realization of his concept of philosophy, his contemporaries knew who witnessed the efforts that he made to acquire knowledge of all the sciences, and the modern reader of his letters knows from the ever-recurring mention of study, literature and books. When the condition of his abbey was such that, to maintain his authority, it was necessary to have recourse to arms, he writes that he prefers the ease which is assured him in his studies to the activity of the battle-field—*delegimus certum otium studiorum quam incertum negotium bellorum*.¹ When 'Adalbero, his archbishop, patron and friend—*quippe cum nobis esset cor unum et anima una*—was suddenly taken from him by death, his mind was so distracted by grief that he almost lost his taste for study—*ut pene omnium obliviscerer studiorum*.² As archbishop and pope, he sought in vain for the quiet of the old scholastic days at Rheims, and, when he writes down *pax atque otium*³ as the supreme aim of man's action in this life, formulating a canon of conduct which reminds us of the Stoic ideal, he unconsciously reveals his inborn dislike for the world which distracts, and he shows that the ground principle of his character is his love of study.

A mind so universal in its tastes, so disposed to take a synthetic view of all knowledge and to correlate the different departments of science, articulating them in one organic whole, was well fitted to rule the church at the beginning of the eleventh century. The last years of the tenth century were dark ones in the Church's history. People felt that a crisis was at hand. The belief that with the century that was drawing to a close, the world too would come to an end was widespread among the superstitious, while the real danger that threatened civilization and religion was far from alarming those who were too ignorant to understand it, or too immersed in local political issues to realize its real proportions. Sylvester II, the philosopher-pope, understanding the conditions with which the papacy had to deal, perceived the need of immediate reform. With a comprehensiveness characteristic of his breadth of mind, he realized that the sphere of papal action had been unduly restricted, that the influence of the authority

¹ Ep. 45.² Ep. 153.³ Ep. 57.

of Peter should be felt in the world outside of Rome, and, under his rule, an era was inaugurated in which the Roman See assumed in European affairs that importance which it was its divine mission to assume. Sylvester II ruled the Church as Gregory, Leo and Nicholas had ruled it in their day, and he left a traditional policy which in later times inspired the enlightened action of Gregory VII and Innocent III.

His view of the relations of Church and State is the view of a synthetic philosopher. In the ruler we see at once the trait which distinguishes the student and the teacher. He is, as an ancient chronicler styles him, the philosopher-pope.¹

Thus we have endeavored briefly to indicate the qualities which characterize this interesting figure in the history of philosophy. By disposition and training, a student of all branches of knowledge, aiming at a synthesis of all in the one reigning science of things human and divine; by providential dispensation, ruler of the Church at one of the most critical moments in her history, Gerbert is always and before all things a philosopher, and it is as a philosopher that he interests us here.

What do we know of the philosophy of Gerbert? The textbooks tell us that he introduced Arabic numerals into Christian Europe, that he was learned beyond his contemporaries in mathematical science, and that he wrote a treatise *De Rationali et Ratione Uti*. This treatise is summarised more or less intelligibly by Ueberweg, Stöckl and others, and with such meagre details the student of the history of philosophy is expected to content himself. But if we turn to the sources as contained in Migne's collection, or to the edition of Gerbert's works by Olleris, we shall find material for a more satisfactory account of the philosophy of Gerbert. The sources may be arranged under different heads as follow:

I. RICHER'S ACCOUNT OF THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN GERBERT AND OTRIC. — Richer, a contemporary of Gerbert, and author of the histories mentioned above, gives us a most interesting description² of a dialectic encounter which took place between Gerbert, Scholasticus of Rheims, and Otric, the most famous of the masters of the schools in Germany. The rival

¹ Adalboldus.

² Migne, CXXXVIII, col. 105, seqq.

teachers met in the presence of the Emperor Otto I, and of many distinguished prelates. The place of meeting was Ravenna, and the year, in all probability, 970. Challenged by his opponent, Gerbert first defines his notion of philosophy. Philosophy, he says, is the understanding of the truth of things human and divine (*Divinarum et humanarum rerum comprehensio veritatis*). It is divided into theoretical and practical. Theoretical philosophy includes physics (*Physica Naturalis*), mathematics (*Mathematica intelligibilis*), and theology (*Theologia intellectibilis*). Practical philosophy is subdivided into moral (*Dispensativa*), economic (*Distributiva*), and political (*Civilis*). The definition is, plainly, a reminiscence of Cicero and the Stoics, while the division is Aristotle's, with the omission of one subdivision, namely, poetics. After a discussion as to the place of physiology and philology in this division, the disputants pass on to the question: What is the (final) cause of philosophy? Gerbert answers that the final cause of philosophy is a knowledge of things human and divine. The answer is worthy of note, as indicating how far Gerbert is removed from the early Christian Fathers, who, after the manner of the Stoics, looked upon philosophy as the way to virtue, the means of acquiring greater sanctity. For Gerbert, philosophy is its own reward; knowledge is the aim of all science; to know more about nature and nature's God is reward, ample and sufficient, for all the labor which the search after truth imposes upon us.

At this point of the discussion, the argument veers round to the Platonic account of the cause of the world. The world, Plato says, was caused by the good will of God. Now, God's will is styled good because He alone is good by essence; other things are good by participation—*constat Deum substantia solummodo bonum; quamlibet vero creaturam participatione bonam*. Then, with a suddenness which startles us, Gerbert carries the discussion into the province of physics and discourses on the cause of shadows. Here he is on ground which is in a certain sense his own, and no doubt it was his brilliant exposition of the physical and mathematical theories introduced in his explanation of the phenomenon of shadow, that won for him the applause of his hearers and decided the contest in his favor.

The question next arose whether the term *mortal* is subordinate to *rational*, or vice versa. This problem of abstract dialectic, which, in the phraseology of modern logic, means which of the terms has the greater extension, occupied the remainder of the time. At a signal from the emperor the argument came to a close, having occupied, our chronicler tells us, nearly the whole day.

This description of the first oral disputation between leaders of the schools is a document the importance of which is overlooked by almost every historian of philosophy. The narrative is, however, lacking in completeness of detail. Richer was perhaps but ill-equipped for the task of adequately recording a debate on questions so abstruse. But, imperfect as the description is, it gives us a clear statement of Gerbert's definition of philosophy, and shows plainly the variety of problems which at that time were considered philosophical. The allusion to the Platonic account of the cause of the world and the distinction of participated good from good unparticipated, are evidence of awakening interest in problems of a metaphysical nature. This point is overlooked by Picavet,¹ as well as by all the historians of philosophy, who regard the philosophy of the ninth and tenth centuries as confined to the discussion of the problems of dialectic, and fail to notice the metaphysical speculations, tentative as they were, which even at that time were suggested by dialectical questions.

II. GERBERT'S PHILOSOPHICAL TREATISES.—The work known as *Geometria Gerberti*, admitted as genuine by many learned historians of mathematics, is judged by Olleris and by Picavet to be a compilation, or an amended or expanded recension, of a treatise composed by our philosopher. In the province of mathematical science, to which he contributed also a treatise, *Libellus de Numerorum divisione*, Gerbert shows his power of original thought. This is the portion of his teaching in which his inventive genius manifested itself most strikingly in the construction of mechanical contrivances for the multiplication and division of numbers, and it was these contrivances, no doubt, that earned for him the reputation for dealing in the dark art.

¹ In a brochure entitled *De l'origine de la scolastique*, M. Picavet attacks those who maintain that scholasticism was, until the thirteenth century, confined to the discussion of dialectical problems.

The *Libellus de Rationali et Ratione Uti* was for a long time the puzzle of puzzles for critics and historians. Cousin and Prantl confess their inability to understand it. Hauréau¹ and Stöckl² fail to realize its philosophical significance. It is, in point of fact, an elaboration of the problem with which the oral disputation at Ravenna ended. On that occasion, it will be remembered, the question was proposed whether *mortal* is to be subjected to *rational*, or vice versa. In the *Libellus*, Gerbert takes up the terms *rationale* and *ratione uti*, and inquires whether the latter should be predicated of the former. Now, since it was a principle admitted by the dialecticians of the day that the predicate must be of wider extension than the subject, and since *reasonable* has greater extension than *using reason*, is not Porphyry wrong when he says that *using reason* may be predicated of *reasonable*?

Gerbert first calls our attention to the difficulties latent in the problem. Objections, he finds, may be urged from three sources: from the relation of *power* to *act*, from the relation of the accidental to the substantial, and from the relation of the higher (*dignitate seu excellentia seu potentia numerosior*) concept to the lower. Before attempting to answer these objections, he takes up the point of doctrine contained in each; he elucidates, for example, at some length, the nature of power and act, and determines the relation of the one to the other. In this way, he makes the objections throw light on the problem and prepares for its discussion, so that when he comes to the thesis that *ratione uti* may be predicated of *rationale*, he has no difficulty in proving his proposition, by the use of the concepts on which the objections themselves rested.

This short treatise—it occupies but ten columns in Migne's edition of Gerbert's works—because of its obscurity of expression, and of the narrow technical range of its ideas, fails to impress the modern reader with a due sense of its importance. Yet it was written for an emperor, to whom, apparently, its abstruseness was no obstacle, and, as Picavet rightly remarks, it is the first writing in which the method which afterwards characterizes the schools is clearly discernible.

¹ Histoire de la Philosophie Scolastique, Vol. I, p. 218.

² Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters, Vol. I, p. 133.

It was Abélard's *Sic et Non* and Alexander of Hales' *Summa* that gave the scholastic method its definite form;¹ the document which we are studying exhibits the first trace of that method. Prantl calls attention to the elements which Gerbert borrows from John Scotus Erigena, Hauréau sees in the *Libellus* an attempt at reconciling Platonism and Aristotelianism. But none of these critics succeeds in seizing the true importance of the little treatise, its introduction of metaphysical speculations in connection with the problems of abstract logic. When Dr. Baeumker will have given us complete editions of the works of Candidus, Heiricus, and of the *Glossae* belonging to the ninth and tenth centuries, we shall, perhaps, be able to form a more just estimate of the metaphysics which flourished in the schools before Aristotle, the metaphysician, became known in Christian Europe.

III. We must now turn to Gerbert's *Letters*, in which he treats incidentally such questions of philosophy as his own studies and the subject of his letters suggest. A letter not contained in Migne's collection, but published by Havet,² is typical of the writer's character. It unfolds an idea of Providism which is a curious combination of Christianity and Stoicism; inexorable fate and a beneficent foreseeing ruler are blended in one notion. But Gerbert is careful to except human action from the all-pervading necessity. In the sphere of future contingencies to which human action belongs, the foreseeing ruler becomes fortune, not fate. In Letter 55 we find similar eclectic attempts. In letters addressed to his friends he extols the worth of human friendship; it is a divine gift; it is the greatest boon of God to man, and charity is the soil on which it must grow in order to produce its best fruits. After this fashion, a Christian Cicero might treat the moral aspect of friendship, but Gerbert is not content until he has given us what we may call the metaphysical principles on which friendship is explained. Friendship is the force by which God holds together the disintegrating forces of the universe; it is by friendship that He unites the corporeal and the incorporeal in man. Friendship is, as it were, the cohesive

¹ Compare Abélard et Alexandre de Hales, fondateurs de la méthode scolastique, Paris, 1896

² Letter 217.

force of the Cosmos—a thought which one cannot help associating with the cosmogenetic theories of Empedocles.

Again, whenever his letters speak of the trials to which his position as abbot and archbishop exposed him, he leads us straightway into a disquisition on the sovereign good. Learn patience in adversity, he writes, for the happiness of man is in peace and resignation. The peace of Church and State, the peace of individual life, should be the aim of our actions here below, and peace unending will be the reward of those actions hereafter. The Stoic loved to treat the world and its irksomeness with fine disdain; he longed for the "passionless peace" of

A philosopher's life in the quiet woodland ways,
Far off from the clamor of liars, boiled in hubbub of lies,
From the long-necked geese of the world that are ever hissing dispraise,
Because their natures are little.

But Gerbert's ideal is not exclusive of the Christian notion of duty towards one's fellow-men. He found his *otium* in *negotium*. His sense of the littleness of the world inspired him with a desire to teach the ignorant, and, as a necessary preparation, to teach himself: *in otio et negotio et docemus quod scimus et addiscimus quod nescimus*.

A man's letters are usually a good index to his character. When one writes, as Gerbert writes, to persons of every station and condition of life, when one treats, as he does, of personal matters, of public affairs, of civil and ecclesiastical occurrences, and when the only trait which all these letters are found to possess in common is an inclination to find a philosophical basis even for the trivial, there cannot be much hesitation in pronouncing philosophy the ruling passion in the mental temperament of the writer. Gerbert's letters, it is true, do not add much to our knowledge of his philosophy; such knowledge as they give is that snatch-and-away kind which is far from satisfactory. But they reveal to us the many-sidedness and completeness of Gerbert's philosophical reading. These traits are more fully established by documents which we are now about to study.

IV. ADALBERO'S POEM.—Among the disciples of Gerbert at the school of Rheims was a certain Adalbero, who became bishop of Laon, and died in 1030. In a poem which he addressed to Robert II of France, he gives, by way of digression, an account of some theories concerning the origin of the uni-

verse,¹ explains briefly the difference between things corruptible and incorruptible, and applies the distinction to the dual nature of man. After an allusion to the difference between necessary and probable arguments, the digression closes with a personal explanation which gives the passage whatever value it possesses in connection with our subject. "I found these things," he writes, "not being unmindful of what I have heard." The remark, as Hauréau² argues, seems to warrant the conclusion that Adalbero is here repeating the lessons learned from Gerbert. M. Picavet agrees with Hauréau that the document may be taken as evidence of Gerbert's teaching, but he is obliged to dissent from Hauréau's verdict that the passage contains a Platonic account of the nature of universals. Here M. Picavet is right. Gerbert was not, as far as we know, a realist of the school of Plato; but, relying, as he does, on Hauréau's translation of the passage in question, M. Picavet can adduce no reason in support of his contention except the antecedent improbability based on a study of Gerbert's life and works. But with the original text of Adalbero's poem before us, we can have no hesitation in pronouncing Hauréau's version inaccurate and his inference unsound.

The passage of Adalbero's poem to which reference is here made, proves, if it be accepted as evidence, that Gerbert in his lessons at Rheims did not confine his attention to dialectical problems, but also carried his inquiries into the region of cosmogony and anthropology.

A document which should not be overlooked in a history of Gerbert's teaching is the letter of Leo, abbot and papal legate. This contemporary witness, writing during the discussion of the rival claims of Gerbert and Arnoulf for the see of Rheims, complains that Gerbert's friends do not respect the authority of the pontifical decrees, because, forsooth, the reigning Pontiff does not recognize as masters Plato, Virgil, Terence, and the herd of philosophers who, soaring in their pride above the earth, sinking like the fishes into the sea, and traveling the earth's surface, like the beasts of the field, try to describe earth, sea and sky. The letter (given by Migne, Vol. CXXXIX, col. 338) is convincing proof of the many-sidedness

¹ Migne, *Patrol. Latina*, vol. CXLI, col. 784.

² *Op Cit.*, vol. I, p. 220.

of Gerbert's teaching. His curriculum, we infer, included a study of nature, and, perhaps, an attempt at studying animal life. For while the report that Gerbert taught these things must have been founded on fact, yet, in the absence of detailed description, we have only to conjecture what may have been the character of these lessons in natural science, and to regret that neither he nor his disciples took pains to write them down. When we remember that not until two centuries later were any of the Aristotelian treatises on nature known to Christian Europe, we realize how interesting would have been a description of the observation by which Gerbert and his disciples sought to verify and supplement the fragmentary scientific doctrines of such Latin writers as were then known and read; while, in the absence of such a description, it is worse than useless to speculate whether Gerbert profited in physics as he did in mathematics by his sojourn in the Christian schools of Spain, or whether, in the tenth century, the Christian schools of Spain could impart any knowledge of the natural sciences.

The treatise *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini* has not been mentioned among Gerbert's works, because, as the title implies, its aim and scope is theological, and because, also, its authenticity is not universally admitted.¹ Internal evidence, however, as far as it avails, is in favor of Pelz, who contends that Gerbert is the author of the work.²

The style is Gerbert's, the allusion to patristic writers, the quotations from Erigena, the references to mathematical studies, are all in keeping with what we know of Gerbert from his other works. Indeed, M. Picavet, without mentioning any of these considerations, quietly assumes the authenticity of the treatise, and proceeds to quote a passage in which the author declares that dialectic and mathematics are of divine origin. The reference to dialectic is found, word for word, in Erigena's *De Divisione Naturæ*. Once more, then, and in a treatise specially devoted to a theological problem, Gerbert shows his predilection for philosophy and gives additional proof of his varied reading in philosophical literature.

When we come to form an estimate of Gerbert as a philosopher, we must not overlook the first and most important canon

¹ Compare Poole's *Illustration of Mediæval Thought*, p. 89.

² Compare Migne, Vol. CXXXIX, col. 177.

of historical criticism ; we must judge a man and his philosophy not by the standard of absolute excellence, but by a measure suited to the conditions under which he lived and wrote. In the tenth century, scholastic philosophy had scarcely learned its first lessons. Erigena, it is true, had made a daring attempt at systematic construction. But Erigena, the first of the school-philosophers, is, in a certain sense, not a schoolman at all. His leaning is towards the mystic view of nature as saturated with the divine, towards the mystic view of mind as incapable of attaining truth unless it be specially illumined from on high ; and were it not that while he theosophizes like a mystic, he speculates regardless of authority, confident, as any rationalist, in the power of human reason, he might well be classed with the Neo-Platonic Fathers. Moreover, Erigena's philosophy failed to exercise on subsequent speculation an influence commensurate with its own vastness. No disciples took up his system. His teaching gave no permanent character to the scholastic movement. The stream which, in the twelfth century, finds a definite course, and runs in a well-defined channel, is, in the ninth century, still at its source. Here and there springs rise, each independent of the others, yet all pouring their contents into the main course which appears farther down. One such source is Erigena's philosophy, another, practically independent of Erigena, is the philosophy of Gerbert ; and because it is a source it should be studied more carefully.

We know little of the details of Gerbert's teaching, but from the meagre data that have come down to us, we may feel safe in describing it as synthetic in its plan, conservative in its method and orthodox in its conclusions. Gerbert, we have seen, defines philosophy as the understanding of the truth of things human and divine. He makes it include all branches of knowledge, and in his oral teaching he must have sought to synthesize these branches by finding some principle common to all. To us, on whom the ever-increasing richness and variety of scientific results press as a burden, this concept of philosophy seems impossible of realization. It was well, however, for the preservation of the learning of the ancient world that Gerbert and men like him considered it their duty to cultivate every science, and took such pains to ascertain what light

the wisdom of the ancients could throw on each problem. This seems to have been Gerbert's fixed practice. Hence the conservative nature of his method. He was a mathematician, a dialectician, a natural philosopher, a pioneer among natural philosophers. But, except in the domain of natural science, his merit lies in accumulating and diffusing knowledge which was accessible to the few, rather than in finding new paths by the exercise of inventive talent. In this consists his great claim to our recognition. He was well read, not only in the philosophical literature which was current in his day, but also in works difficult of access, works which remained unknown even to his successors of the eleventh century. Never once was he visited with ecclesiastical censure by reason of the novelty of his doctrines. He knew how to keep within the bounds of orthodoxy. Heresy, it is maintained, has its uses. It is certain, however, that heresy did not aid the cause of philosophy during the middle ages. The condemnation of Berengar and Abélard, and the admonition of the council before which Gilbert de la Porrée was cited, threw discredit on philosophy and inaugurated a period of reaction for which those are accountable whose excesses were the occasion for invoking authority. It was such men as Gerbert, who, by teaching in a spirit at once synthetic and discriminating, the wisdom of the ancients, and by their constant care never to overstep the limits of orthodoxy, won such prestige for philosophy as to render the further progress of the scholastic movement possible.

Gerbert's influence on his own generation must have been considerable. The very grotesqueness of the notions which the superstitious entertained in his regard, is evidence of the greatness of his reputation. It was, apparently, his oral teaching rather than his written works that attracted the attention of the men of his day, and his disciples, we may safely suppose, perpetuated his doctrines and extended the influence of his teaching. To that teaching and to the teaching of those who succeeded Gerbert as masters of the church schools, the dialectical movement which through Roscellin, Abélard and St. Anselm was continued down to St. Thomas, owes more than can at this time be determined.

To the student of general history, Gerbert appeals as a man who followed in adversity as well as in prosperity his ideals of

truth and justice. To the ecclesiastical historian, he is the Pope who, during his brief reign, succeeded in elevating the Church to a higher sense of the rank which she should take in the march of European history. To the student of philosophy, he is what we have endeavored to describe him, erudite, conservative, orthodox, synthetic, far-reaching in his influence, a pioneer in natural science, a safe guide in dialectics. In these three phases of his personality, we see a certain oneness: the man, the pope, the philosopher are the same person. The secret of his success in the different parts which he played is, apart from the moral qualities which gave stability and constancy, the breadth of view which characterized the man, the power of seeing many things *sub specie unitatis*.

If M. Picavet fails to present the philosophy of Gerbert in its true perspective, his failure is not due to the lack of sympathy with his subject. Throughout his brochure, and indeed, in all he has written on the history of scholastic philosophy, he shows himself a fair-minded scholar who, though not a professed adherent of any philosophical sect, is prepared to recognize worth wherever he sees it. We cannot refrain here from quoting a passage with which M. Picavet brings his work to a close: "We see," he writes, "in our own day a Sovereign Pontiff whom Catholics revere and whose lofty intelligence the world of the unbelieving admires, who endeavors to realize in our modern civilization the harmony of Church and State which Gerbert strove to bring about under very different circumstances." Those who know what Leo XIII has done for the revival of the study of scholasticism, who understand and appreciate his watchword, *Vetera novis augere et perficere*, will recognize in the successor of Sylvester II an heir not only to his high authority but also to his synthetic capacity of mind; while those who have at heart the progress of philosophical studies in the church schools of our own day, will look confidently to the beginning of the new century, in the hope that it may open, as the eleventh century did, under the enlightened rule of one who, in his encyclicals and his other official announcements, has proved himself a Philosopher-Pope.

WILLIAM TURNER.

St. Paul Seminary,
St. Paul, Minn.

DOMESTIC LIFE IN MEDIAEVAL ENGLAND.¹

The work before us is remarkable chiefly as an index of the progress made by the new in its rivalry with the old style of history²-writing. This latter, known variously as the literary, political, pictorial and individualistic, reigned supreme from the days of Thucydides, Herodotus and above all Plutarch down almost to the end of the last century. It was characterized on the one hand by lack of exact research; on the other by majesty and brilliancy of style, variety of color, love for portraiture and hero-worship. A five minutes' perusal of the pages of Gibbon, Macaulay or Hume gives a good impression of the old style. According to it man must be considered as an individual, not as a representative of his species; true, the mass of the people also merit attention, but only as a background for the portrait of the individual; hence there are no real historical facts except those of the individual when he has raised himself above the uniform, insignificant facts of the crowd. In a word, according to its great prophet, Thomas Carlyle, universal history is fundamentally the history of great men or heroes; all that has come to pass is but the embodiment of the thoughts existing in *their* minds; their history is the soul of the world's history, since they are the seers who alone behold the divine idea of the world and reveal it to humanity; they are the messengers of God, the lightning direct from His hand, the indispensable saviors of their epochs, to whose thoughts the "thoughts of all starting up as from an enchanted sleep, answer 'yes, even so.'"³

¹ *Social England*—a record of the progress of the people in religion, laws, learning, arts, industry, commerce, science, literature and manners from the earliest times to the present day, by various writers, edited by H. D. Thrall, D. C. L. 6 vols., 8vo. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896-'97.

² See article on "Methods of Historical Inquiry" in *Dublin Review*, April, 1886; also J. Cotter Morrison's article on "History" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

³ "He (Scott) would fain lift up a piece of the past whole and unbroken as a fragment of veritable human experience, with its deep inarticulate suggestions to the conscience and the will. Working as an artist, with an idea of the whole and a genius for distinguishing essentials from non-essentials in the myriad of details, the historian must attempt the almost impossible feat of rivalling reality, of presenting things in succession so that they may live in the imagination as simultaneous, since once they were so in fact; of presenting a *series* so that it may be recognized as a *group*." Edwin Dowden, *Transcripts and Studies*, London, 1896, p. 184.

But the field hitherto occupied solely by this school has been for nearly a century successfully disputed by a band of invaders grouped under the general name of the sociological school. Their cardinal principles are that man is moulded by his social environment, that he is only an emanation of the collective characteristics of that environment, that therefore this environment is to be studied in all its aspects, not merely in its prominent individuals who are after all only exceptions to the general rule ; furthermore, that all national groups constitute a single social group whose phenomena are to be studied, irrespective of time or place.

The causes which gave birth to this school are so many and so interlaced with one another as well as with those conditioning a revival of mediæval studies, that only with great difficulty can one effect an orderly presentation of them. Still some causes are fairly prominent and easily detected. First, the marvelous advances made in the physical sciences during the present century, and the consequent rise of the mercantile classes imbued with larger sympathies for the masses out of which they arose, have diverted the attention of all from the consideration of problems purely political to those affecting the social conditions of mankind, conditions that are themselves so powerfully affected by the scientific discoveries of the century. Second, the rise of the romantic school of literature accentuated the sociological unity of all, irrespective of limitations of time and place, by portraying a past civilization and proving it to be one with the present, possessing not only the same "hands, feet, and passions," but also the same life-problems. Third, a powerful impulse in the same direction was given by the upheavals of the French Revolution, which so ruthlessly, yet so thoroughly, tore away the silken veil of hypocritical affectation and hollow sentimentality of the "ancien regime," and showed in its place the real face of man with his real passions for good and evil, not the made-up man of the court and salon ; the real man with sympathies for all men whether of high or low degree, whether be-wigged and be-powdered or unkempt and unnoticed ; whether king or noble, peasant or mine-slave. Fourth, then the comparative and evolutionary methods of investigation, so widely applied to other sciences

such as biology and philology, affected the study of history by accustoming the student to give his attention not only to single men, nations or epochs, but to all humanity, all climes and all periods; to closely observe the gradual development and influence of all the forces of civilization whether intellectual, such as universities, schools, and theories of philosophy, or religious, such as creeds, superstitions, clerical morals and power, or literary, such as the formation of languages and their literature, or finally and above all lately, physical, such as food, clothing, dwellings, disease, commerce, and industry. But amongst these by far the most potent impulse is simultaneous with the rise of the theory and practical results of the science of sociology, whose foundation dates from the eighteenth century in the writings of Adam Smith, but whose extension and practical importance are a product of our own, largely as a result of the theories of Comte.¹ Up to this the idea of the "state" had dominated minds to the depreciation of all other considerations, and as a result the acts deemed important by the historian were those of the "state" or of its great rulers and thinkers—such acts as treaties, wars, succession of princes down to their great vices and little foibles. But the new science now considered the state merely as one of many other sociological phenomena, as something smaller than society at large, and man therefore not merely in his political but as well in his intellectual, religious, and economic conditions. Under its influence, then, the historian began to change his method of writing, a change apparent even in the works of as early a writer as Gibbon, and, not content with treaties, wars, doings of princes or "heroes," to deal as well with minute customs, superstitions, the cut of dress, the cooking of food, and a hundred other things deemed uniform and insignificant by his predecessors.

The new method found favor, and has, to a great extent, supplanted the old, for of the earlier English authorities Gibbon alone holds his own, whilst Hume, Macaulay, and Robertson, who moulded the historical opinions of our fathers, have, as historians of the past, been buried in oblivion by a more or less grateful posterity, or else have become original authorities for

¹Cf. *La Littérature Moderne* by Ferdinand Brunetière, p. 455.

their own age only. However, the recent congress of German historians lately held at Innsbruck¹ shows that many gallantly keep up the individualistic traditions of Ranke. Therefore, in the making of a choice of method the student might well use great care. While his modern environment might naturally incline him in favor of the new school, especially if a Catholic, since it is so intimately connected both in causes and in time with the revival of mediævalism, to whose influence is due the conversion of such able men as Hurter and Phillipps; nevertheless it is to be confessed that our gains in accuracy and range of information are only too often counterbalanced by a dearth of dramatic portraiture, literary style, and general philosophic grasp of history. Then again that peculiar inspiration which endowed men like Shakespeare and Scott with their marvellous ability to read into the hearts of past men, regarding whom their actual information could have at best been slight, grows rarer under the new conditions.² Perhaps, therefore, the future historian will be eclectic, combining as far as possible the scientific analysis of the new with the philosophic synthesis of the old school, a combination which has already been made in such works as the *History of Civilization* by Guizot, and is at times apparent in the eloquent pages of the *Norman Conquest* of Freeman.

Leaving aside these preliminary considerations of historical methods suggested by a reading of Mr. Thrall's book, its intrinsic merits may well engage our attention. With regard to the rather harsh criticisms of certain reviews, we mildly suggest that the critics do not sufficiently reflect that many of the real and serious defects alluded to are almost necessary in a work of such vast proportions; furthermore, that the work is intended not so much for the specialist as for the general reader, to whom is now given a far better opportunity than he ever before had of acquiring a general idea of England, ancient, mediæval, and modern.

¹ See *Revue Historique* for Nov. Dec., 1897.

² "Though popular progress and the advancement of the masses . . . in social development . . . may be a very important part, yet it is not the whole of history, still less the whole of the history of this nation. The influence of kings and nobles has, at all events until recent times, been so marked and continuous . . . that their personal adventures cannot be disintegrated from the general body of our history without blurring its lineaments and mangling its due proportions." *London Quarterly*, April, 1878.

Moreover, from a Catholic standpoint we have no hesitation in according a hearty welcome to the volumes dealing with the pre-Reformation period, since they show, in general, a sympathy for Catholic traditions and present no malevolent misrepresentation of facts ; indeed, very seldom any misrepresentation whatever. One might, however, ask with some reason why an eminent Catholic authority like Dom Gasquet was not requested to write, for instance, the chapter on the "Black Death." Then, again, why is Lingard's "Anglo-Saxon Antiquities" not mentioned in the bibliographies? Dr. Lingard is far from being a back number, so far in fact that had his *Antiquities* been consulted by the well-known author of the "Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury," he would hardly have made his sweeping assertions (Introduction, p. 22), in regard to the teaching and doctrine of Transubstantiation in the early English Church.¹

Our purpose in this study is to offer a résumé of the information contained in the extensive volumes of Mr. Thraill concerning the private life of the English people in their Catholic period. For that reason, we shall try to compass under certain general rubrics the chief outlines of a very voluminous presentation.

I. HOUSES.—Nothing so well illustrates the difference in social rank characteristic of a feudal regime as the distinction between the residences of the very wealthy and those of the great mass of the people. Precisely, therefore, in that period of English history immediately succeeding the Conquest, par excellence the feudal period, we find this distinction most in evidence. Until the thirteenth century the noble lived in his impregnable castle, usually of stone, sometimes of wood, overlooking from some summit the surrounding country ; the sides varying from 25 to 100 feet in length, from thirty to ten in thickness, forming a rectangle with huge towers at each corner, and surrounded when possible by a moat full of water. Below was the store-room, higher up the rooms for the owners and garrison, reached by narrow staircases made in the thickness of the walls. Such was the typical castle, long the curse of England during the twelfth century and almost up to the age described

¹ See *Antiquities*, p. 294 et seq.

in "Ivanhoe," when they were filled, as the chronicle goes, with "devils" for the perpetration of all manner of wicked deeds. Simultaneously with the rise of the commons in the next century and the dawn of an era of greater order as the result of the vigorous administration of the Plantagenets, the average noble was glad enough to exchange this really uncomfortable abode for one which would combine the greater freedom of out-door life with the security given by fortification in an age when police protection, such as we know it, could not be said to exist. Hence we now see the use of the fortified manor-house, whose main defenses consisted only in a moat and a tower of refuge. By the fifteenth century this gave way to the real dwelling house of the wealthy land owner. Comfort increased in proportion. The making of bricks, the art of which had been forgotten ever since the departure of the Romans, was reintroduced about the year 1400, and simultaneously came into existence real chimneys in place of the old smoke-vents cut into the wall in Norman days. Yet, withal, even the wealthy in those days must have found their houses rather uncomfortable; a single bedroom was usually thought convenient, nor was much done in the way of wainscoting and ceiling; houses containing even four beds for the accommodation of their inmates were thought to be extravagantly furnished; in fact, internal magnificence was chiefly shown in glittering rows of plate and pewter.

The condition of the houses of the lower classes may easily be inferred. They were for a long time of wood, never until the fifteenth century of brick, built of posts, matted and plastered with clay or mud, usually one story high, although upper stories, called "solars," were begun to be added in the fourteenth century. Chimneys long remained a luxury of the rich, while by the date just mentioned glass windows seem to have been pretty generally in vogue, although they were quite costly, since we are told that when a certain nobleman left his town residence the glass windows were taken out and carefully stowed away until his return. The upper chambers, of course, corresponded to our sleeping rooms, but their comfort can be estimated by the fact that for a long while, even in great castles, they were reached by means of an outside staircase, and

in the poorer houses by a ladder. Of parlors, even in the houses of wealthy merchants, we find no mention before the fifteenth century. The sale-room of the merchant, which must have been part of the dwelling house, consisted of an outside booth.

In the towns huge signs swung overhead. They were obliged by law to be at least nine feet above ground, so as to allow a man on horseback to pass under unharmed, a regulation which in a high wind must have proved a poor protection to the heads of the passers by. Outside the door, at least in the towns, were thrown all kinds of refuse and ordure, which, when left to the sanitary precautions of the porcine scavenger, must have been anything but pleasant to the senses or conducive to good health. Another peculiarity was that later on the upper stories began to overhang the lower after the fanciful way so well known to picture books.

Here and there different material may have been used, and a different construction adopted, but the typical house of the mediæval man below the rank of nobility could hardly have been other than here described.

II. FURNITURE AND DECORATION.—On entering into an English mediæval house one would be instantly struck with the absence of painting as an adornment of the walls. Painting as an art appears in mediæval England merely as a very humble handmaid of ecclesiastical architecture or of manuscript illumination, and seldom as an ornament of the home either rich or poor. Instead of pictures, therefore, he would see in the halls of the noble his sword, shield, lance, battle-ax, coat-of-mail or plate-armor; later on, his coat-of-arms, and in the cottages of the poorer, the implements both of husbandry and of war; above all, that terrible six-foot bow which made the English infantry so invincible at Crécy and Agincourt. Our wall-paper and plastering would in the houses of the well-to-do be supplied by hanging curtains or tapestry. Carpets were introduced as late as the time of Henry V, but were then luxuries for the very wealthy, ordinary folks being satisfied for a long time with the bare ground, on which rushes were strewn, or later on, with stone or brick floors covered with matting, frequently also with strewn sand. Books were of

course seldom in evidence, the art of printing having been invented too late to render their existence hardly common outside of the *Scriptoria* of the monasteries and other centres of learning, or in the house of some nobleman or great churchman whose ample resources enabled them at times to make very extensive collections—an exception, however, must be made for the Prymer or prayer-book which was to be seen well-nigh in all houses. Glass mirrors, first made in Belgium or Germany, also came into use in this century. Of furniture, properly speaking, many things were lacking that now the very poorest laborer considers necessities. A twelfth century writer thus describes how a bed-chamber should be ordered, speaking, we presume, of a well-to-do establishment. The walls should be hung with tapestry, a chair at the head of the bed, a bench at the foot; upon the bedstead a feather bed with a bolster, the latter being covered with a short sheet over which a handsome cloth on the part where the head is to rest; over this, sheets of sendel, silk, or linen, all covered with a counterpane of some green stuff bordered with skins of cat, beaver, or marten. Sitting-rooms there were none—the lady of the house receiving her guests of both sexes in her bed-room. Out in the hall the twelfth and thirteenth century furniture would consist of a table, trestles, benches, tablecloths, basin and ewer, hearth with fire burning, together with logs, irons, and tongs. To this add a pair of bellows, a long settle, a chair, a side table, a lectern for reading, and a screen. Of course all these articles would be found only in the houses of the very wealthy, since we are told that the furniture of even wealthy merchants in the fifteenth century was poor and mean compared not only to the princely establishments of the modern man of means, but even to the homes of a very large class of American workmen.

III. COOKING.—When we come to the culinary department we meet with a lavishness of display and abundance of good cheer not behind our own age of plenty and show, nor was good living confined to the more well-to-do classes. In fact the English have always had a high standard of diet. They preferred to eat no bread “that beans in were, but of cocket or clerematyn, or else of clean wheat—ne no piece of bacon, but if it be fresh flesh, other fish fried or baked,” above all avoiding

rye-bread (black-bread), which was the staple food of the French peasantry and the cause, perhaps, of the greatest dietetic maladies of the Middle Ages—St. Anthony's fire or ergotism. In the thirteenth century wheat bread was almost universal in the poorest classes of the English people, while the use of wine and salt was equally common. The "Vision of Piers Plowman" gives the diet of the small farmer in the reign of Edward III, and it is certainly not small—green cheeses, curds, cream, unleavened cakes, horse-bread, "bran baked" for the children, leeks, parsley, cabbage, peas, beans, onions, chervils, and cherries. He was without chickens, geese, and pigs. Apparently he ate little meat, but we are informed later on in the next century that the poor ate "*plentifully of all kinds of flesh and fish*;" whilst other vegetables like turnips, gourds, mushrooms, rice, spinach, and various herbs were becoming quite common, and beer or ale was holding its own with wine.

In the higher classes both eating and drinking were frequently carried to great excess. The Normans were originally quite temperate and fastidious, but they soon lost this characteristic from contact with the Anglo-Saxons. Of their *menus* we have hardly any record, but Alexander Neckham (twelfth century) furnishes us with a treatise on utensils, which gives a fair idea of their kitchen interiors. According to it no feast of to-day could be more elaborate and no kitchen better fitted up. The list of fish alone is astounding—salmon, soles, conger, plaice, mullet, ray, dog-fish, mackerel, turbot, herring, lobster, stickle-backs, oysters, bass, lamprey, mussel, smelt, gudgeon, barbel, loggerhead, seahorse and cod. One menu preserved to us gives the following courses: "First is brought in a boar's head with its tusks in its snout garnished with flowers; then venison, cranes, peacocks and swans, wild geese, kids, pigs and hens. The third course was of spiced or seasoned meats with wine both red and white. Then came pheasants, woodcock, partridges, fieldfares, larks and plovers; lastly came 'white powder' and sweetmeats." The drinks were of various kinds, cider, beer, ale, must (a kind of claret), mead, perry, rose wine, fruity wine, wine of Auverne and clove wine "for hard drinkers and gluttons, whose thirst is insatiable."

Even this elaborate menu was not long enough for the fifteenth century gourmand, as is evidenced by the feast given in honor of the marriage in 1403 of Henry IV with Joan of Navarre.¹

What surprises us now are the quantity and variety of fish which our English forefathers ate. Thus a menu of the same date for the "Three Courses of Fish" gives a really astonishing list.² No wonder that Henry III ordained that, except for extraordinary occasions, no more than two dishes should be served at one meal—a real hardship for some who were accustomed to at least ten or sixteen.

The appurtenances of the table were about the same as our own—a clean white cloth, a cup to each person, knives, but no forks, napkins, spoons, finger bowls. The style of helping oneself was quite different from our modern etiquette. Each one cut off that part of the meat which suited him, depositing it on a slice of bread which, until a late period, served as a plate and was itself eaten last. The fingers did the duty of the fork, and were then cleansed as to-day.

Table manners, at least among gentle folk, were insisted on rigorously. Thus the esquire is told to "cut his bread on a trencher and not to break it, to take his broth with a spoon and not to drink it, not to eat with his mouth full, to wipe his lips before he drinks, not to dip his meat in his salt-cellar nor to put his knife in his mouth, to taste every dish brought to him, to have a clean knife and trencher for his cheese, and, finally, at the close of the meal to clean his knife, put it away and then wash his hands." Nor must the reader conclude a lack of good manners from the fact that each one cut from the meat what he liked, since by the end of the fifteenth century we meet with a long list of names for carving, which suggests

¹ *First course*.—"Fylettes in galentyne (the herb called galyngale,) Vyand riall (honey wine, rice, spices, etc.) Beef, mutton, etc., cynets, fat capon, pheasants, chewets of flesh or fish, a sotelte. *Second course*.—Venisno, jelly, suckling pigs, rabbits, bitterns, stuffed hens partridge, leach (made of cream, isinglass, sugar and almonds,) boiled brawn, a sotelte. *Third course*.—Almond cream, pears in syrup, roast venison, woodcock, plover, rabbits, quails snipe, fieldfare, custard, sturgeon, fretour, a sotelte. (These soteltes were devices made in paste or sugar, sometimes quite elaborate.) Needless to mention that these names, if written as they were spelt, would be as puzzling as the modern menu done up in French.

² *First Course*.—Vyand ryall, Lombardy broth, salt fish, powdered lampreys, pike, breme, roast salmon, Lombardy custard, a sotelte. *Second*.—Porpoise, jelly, breme, salmon, congre turnarde, plaice, lamprey pie, leach, crowned panthers (a sotelte). *Third*.—Almond cream, pears in syrup, tench in couples, trout, fried flounders, perch, roast lamprey, loach, crabs and crayfish, crowned eagle (a sotelte.)

that the office had become quite important and demanded considerable skill.¹

On the whole, therefore, Englishmen of the middle ages in all ranks of life seem to have been very good eaters as far as quantity goes. It seems equally safe to affirm that they were the same "thirsty" race that they now are. As regards quality their food and drink was protected by a process of inspection which might be well employed even nowadays. Sellers of butter, new and old mingled together, were put in the pillory—a fitting repose for the modern venders of oleomargarine. The ale "conners" were obliged by law to see that a good article was sold. Finally, a reasonable price, gauged by the cost of production, was set upon all articles so that no one ran the risk of being cheated. Thus, in the reign of Henry IV the "best goose went for six pence, the best pullet for two, the best rabbit, with the skin, for four, the best wild duck for three, the best snipe for one penny, four larks for one penny, the best woodcock for three pence, the best partridge for four pence, a dozen thrushes for six pence, the best heron for sixteen pence, and twelve pigeons for eight pence. In the year 1314 the best ox went for sixteen shillings, the best cow for twelve, a fat hog two years old for three shillings four pence.

Of course to get at the modern value of money we must multiply these figures by six or eight, yet the fact that these prices were fixed sometimes by parliament itself in order to bring them within the purchasing power of the poor people is a proof that they were then deemed quite reasonable, and, in spite of the benefits brought to modern trade by the competitive system, it is very doubtful indeed if the old patriarchal system of protecting the poor against the *cornering* of the necessities of life was not as beneficial, perhaps more so, to the poor at large than our present regime.

IV. HOME AMUSEMENTS.—As early as the reign of Henry I, a chronicler calls his country "merry England" (*Anglia plena jocis*); the English, according to him, being a free people of a free spirit and a free tongue, with abundance of good

¹ Thus one must know how "to break a deer, lift a swan, spoil a hen, sauce a capon, unbrace a mallard, disfigure a peacock, display a crane, wing a partridge, mince a plover, thigh a woodcock, string a lamprey, side a haddock, tame (tayne) a crab, barbe a lobster," etc.

things for themselves and something to spare for their neighbors across the sea. Now, while this reputation might possibly have been due rather to their material prosperity compared with that of their neighbors than to any natural joyousness of character, at least so far as the slow and heavy Saxon was concerned; nevertheless, it indicates that their lives were spent in other exercises besides warring or "staggering behind the plow." They must have believed in the words of the old song, that the world was made for fun and frolic. Certainly there was no dearth of amusements in the open air, where until a near period tournaments were quite often indulged in by the knights in spite of the Church's prohibition of such dangerous sport. Cock-fighting, horse-racing (no betting however), sham battles, boating, skating (skates made of bone), archery, and hunting, were common amusements. Hunting was largely confined to the wealthy, as is proven by the forestry laws. We may add to this list the game which seems so peculiarly English—football.

Indoor amusements were fewer, the surroundings were not comfortable enough to be inviting. Books, except in the houses of some literary noble like Robert of Gloucester, the patron of the historian, William of Malmesbury, or in those of clerics were, of course, quite rare until printing came in; but the romances of troubadours and minstrels, the narratives of the aged, and, perhaps, also a visiting cleric supplied them with an amount of light literature, really enormous for the rich and for the poor, doubtless more extensive than that enjoyed by the poorer classes of today.

Of amusements proper there were for the better classes chess and draughts. Girls embroidered, had pet birds, Italian greyhounds, and lap-dogs. Music and dancing were the usual requisites in the education of ladies and gentlemen. The musical instruments were many, as the viol, organ, chimes of small bells, fiddle, the psaltery or shawn, zither, horn, trumpet, bagpipes, drum, tabor, cymbals, hurdy-gurdy, flageolet, and above all the harp, the favorite instrument of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln. For

"Next his chaumbre, besyde his study,
Hys Harper's chaumbre was fast thereby.

Many tymes, by nightes and dayes,
He had solace of notes and layes.

The vertu of the Harpe, through skill and ryght,
Will destroy the fendy's (fiend's) might;
And to the Cros(s) by gode skeyl
Ys the Harpe lykeued weyl."

A curious fallacy regarding the Middle Ages is that the love of nature was withered like summer grass by the overpowering influence of dry sacerdotalism.¹

I call it a fallacy. It is so far untrue that, not to mention the love of nature so evident in the romance of the day, the garden played a most important part in the home-life of the mediæval man whenever he could afford one. In the reign of Henry II a chronicler speaks of the "spacious and beautiful" gardens in the suburbs of London. Thus, in the fifteenth century, we have the description of an admirable garden, there being the cypress, sotlerwood and cykamoure, box, beech, laurel, date, damson, fig, maple, poplar, plane trees covering green arbors, and all manner of flowers, such as the "red rose and the lyly floure," and

On every branche sate byrdes thre,
Syngyne with great melody;
The jaye jangled them amonge,
The lark began that mery songe,
The goldfynche set her notes full mery chere,
When she was bent upon a brere,
And many other foules mo, etc.

The ladies spent much of their time outdoors gathering wild flowers to make into garlands, playing at ball and organizing picnics. Thus in Chaucer's "Frankelyn's Tale" is narrated how Dorigene's friends try to rouse her from her melancholy by means of a picnic:

They goon and pleye hem al the longe daye;
And this was in the sixte morne of May,
Which May hadde peynted with his softe shoures
This gardyn, ful of leves and of floures,
And crafte of mannes hand so curiously
Arrayed hadde this garden, trewly,
That nevere was there gardyn of swich prys,
But if it were the very Paradys.
The odour of floures and the fresshe sighte
Wolde han makid any herte lighte
That evere was born, but if to greet siknesse,
Or to greet sorwe, helde it in distresse,
So ful was it of beautee with pleasaunce.

¹ "During the long dream of the Middle Ages nature ceased to have deep poetic and spiritual meaning for men: *Ceased indeed to enter into their lives.*"—"Short Studies in Literature" by Hamilton Wright Mable, p. 57.

Surely one must not wait for Thompson or Gray to find a love of nature in English hearts.¹

V. EDUCATION.—Education was, of course, gained at schools out of the house. Hence, our only excuse for mentioning it is the importance given to domestic instruction. Then, as now, were outside schools where the children of gentlemen were taught good manners wherewith to appear well in "society," but at home every girl was taught things which their descendants of to-day are not always any too proficient in. She was taught to love God, to go to church "*in spite of the rain*," to give alms freely, not to *talk in church*, not to be rude nor laugh loudly, but "soft and mild," not to walk too fast, not to "*brandish*" with her head, or "*wriggle*" her shoulders, or swear, to drink moderately, to be cautious in her relations with the other sex and accept no presents, and

"If any man biddith the worschip, and wolde wedde thee,
Loke that thou scorne him not, what-so-evere he be,
But schewe it to thi freendis and (conceal) it nought;
Site not bi him, neither stoonde; there synne mygte be wrought,
For a sclaudre reised ille
Is yuel for to stille
Mi leve childe.

Beside this general instruction girls were taught a smattering of medicine and surgery so as to be physicians-in-ordinary to the household. Above all they were taught that art apparently simple, but which generations of the suffering sterner sex have for ages declared the art most difficult of acquirement—housewifery.

VI. SICKNESS AND DEATH.—If England was merry she was equally sad, since the mortality during this period must have been frightful, the population from the Conquest to the Reformation standing practically stationary, between two million and two million and a half, although before the black death some have estimated it at four and a half. This was due to three main causes—war, famine, and defects of sanitation and medical

¹ Even their bad Latin could not hinder the mediæval rhymer from indulging in descriptive poetry, as the following lines from the song preserved in Wright's *Political Songs*, 1839, p. 23:

"Tempus erat quo terra novo pubescere partu
Ceperat, et teneras in crines solverat herbas,
Vellera pratorum redolens infantia florum
Pinxerat, et, renovas crispans coma primula silvas,
Innumeras avium revocavit ad organa linguas," etc.

skill. War of some shape seems to have been almost the regular thing. Welsh and Scotch wars alternate with the French in tiresome monotony, which we would imagine would have been enough to satisfy the instincts of the most martial people without the further addition of the crusades and interminable civil wars. Added to the horrors of continuous war the leprosy contributed also its share to the mortality, though not to the extent so generally supposed. Leper hospitals were first founded soon after the Conquest by the benevolence of kings, queens, chivalrous nobles, pious ladies, bishops, and abbots. The disease, however, never attained to proportions of any real moment, a few cases existing in a village here and there, one or two in a market town, a dozen or more in a city, a score or so in a whole diocese, whilst its absolute disappearance from England is coincident with the appearance of that general prosperity which is so marked a characteristic of the fifteenth century, in contrast to the miseries occasioned by the black death in the preceding.

But famine and pestilence stalked like two hideous demons from one end of England to the other with a frequency which now would be impossible. A great famine fell about 1086 or 1087, causing enormous loss of life. There was considerable famine and pestilence under William Rufus, so also under Henry and Stephen. Under Henry II the famines ceased for a time. Again, under Richard I (1196) the poor were buried in trenches. So, too, in 1257-1259 and 1289. They continued more or less frequent for forty years, at times being so sharp that some ate the flesh of their own children, or of others which they kidnapped, while the inmates of prisons tore in pieces and devoured, half alive, the new comers. Then in 1348-9 came the terrible black death which carried off half the entire population, and laid the seeds for later epidemics, of 1361, 1368-9, 1375, 1382, 1390-1. In this last visitation eleven thousand died in the city of York alone. Famines appear again in 1405, 1407, 1438, 1439, 1464-5, 1471, 1478, 1485, not entirely disappearing until 1666. Each famine was generally due to a succession of two or three bad crops, for during the Middle Ages England was practically an agricultural country, so that the loss of a crop meant loss of well-nigh all,

whilst the system of farming was apparently so rude that a failure was quite easy. As a result of scarcity people would eat unwholesome food, hence the pestilence, except when the latter was, like the black death, brought from abroad, or was due to the woful lack of sanitary measures, a sense of which seems to have arisen only after the latter visitation. The first "sanitary act" was passed by Parliament in 1388 and prohibited the throwing of dung, garbage, etc., into ditches and rivers. Originally each householder had the duty of removing refuse, but in 1540 the town of Ipswich had regularly appointed officers to see to it. As late as 1343 the offensive latrines, dust-heaps, and the like were in the narrow lanes leading down to the Thames. Of course the smallness of the towns did not as a rule necessitate the precautions of the present day. Still, with all due allowance the defects in this matter can hardly be termed otherwise than gross.

When a man did fall sick, medical aid was at best only rudimentary. The Norman girls were, we have seen, taught a little medicine and surgery. Later on the science was chiefly in the hands of Jews and Franciscan Friars, who knew, of course, all the country-lore as to the use of herbs and in surgery could use splints, lancets, bandages, and hot brick. They knew also how to stanch blood, extract missiles, reduce dislocations, and perform the simpler operations of cutting, trepanning and the like. Beyond this they knew very little, as is easily seen from the fact that medicine was supposed to have quite an intimate connection with astrology or astronomy. The days and hours for drawing blood were regulated by the changes in the moon. Roger Bacon himself complained that most of the physicians of the day were ignorant of the better part of medicine because they neglected astronomy. The latter also counseled the use of charms, but for a good reason, namely, because they bring the patient to a better frame of mind. Nevertheless, this indicates the high esteem in which they were held by the average patient. Many practitioners must have been mere impostors, since a book of the year 1300 counsels young doctors "never to visit a patient without doing something new, lest the patient should say that they can do nothing without their book." Again the ceremonial of the

Church often played an important part in the administration of medicine. While the medicine was being compounded, the patient would repeat twelve times the psalm *Miserere*, then several *Pater Nosters*, then drink the dose and wrap up warm; or he would sing the psalm *Salvum me fac, Deus*, then drink the draught out of a church bell, the priest finishing the cure with the prayer over him, *Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens*; or else the remedy was taken at the shrine of a saint, or after touching the bier of a holy man, or at a holy well.

But we must not, therefore, laugh at these English forefathers, since in an age when it was impossible for medicine to make much headway against the disabilities imposed by the want of books and the low state of the natural sciences, it was only natural for the poor people to look in distress up to God and the saints, or even to those great powers of nature the very ignorance of whose strength made them all the more awful and respected. Moreover, they were far from being blind to their imperfections, since the sarcasm of Molière against physicians was anticipated long before his time. John of Salisbury in the twelfth century laments that for his sins he was so often in the doctors' hands, whilst the "Vision of Piers Plowman" says that "Murderers are many leeches—Lord them amend." They laughed at their own failings just as we do now; true, they were children as far as progress is concerned, but they knew it and sought to be men.

VII. POLICE.—Judging by the accounts of contemporary chroniclers, the poor for a long period after the Conquest must have had but little protection against the lawlessness of their Norman masters, the same who built castles and filled them with "devils." Lawlessness rose and fell in proportion as a king was strong or weak in his administration, and with the decay of feudalism such excesses grew less. It naturally ceased soonest in the town which had by degrees acquired certain rights of self-government not possessed by the people in the country who were subject to the lord. But even in the towns we meet with no such regular system of police as we are to-day accustomed to. One of the duties of an alderman in the fourteenth century was to "arrest persons who dared to wander by night about the streets of the city after curfew with

swore
the t
the sa
the s
const
a cas
this
at th
dard,
reason

VI
tions
ing, s
with
tiated
sisted
der w
occas
flat c
on ta
in.

enou
labor
to th

In
alter
use o
gold,
head
cap u
of va
sheep
Wom
over
posed
had
in fa
bodie
becan

sword or buckler, or with other arms to do mischief, to shut the taverns and ale houses at the same time, and expel from the same all suspicious persons." These worthies, together with the sheriffs, lords, bailiffs, coroners, conservators of the peace, constables and other such officers, punished crime according as a case happened to come under their jurisdiction, but beyond this no other system of police is apparent. Still, local crime, at the end of the fourteenth century, judging by our standard, was fairly rare, so that a family could sleep at home with reasonable security.

VIII. DRESS: VARIA.—The variety of dress and the variations of fashion offer as wide a field as that of food and cooking, so that the present sketch must perforce content itself with giving only a general outline. The Normans at first initiated very few changes from Anglo-Saxon attire, which consisted in a belted tunic, sometimes a mantle fastened at the shoulder with a brooch or ornamented pin, drawers tight fitting and occasionally banded diagonally on the knee; sometimes a flat cap, boots short and of various colors, also shoes that later on tapered to a point. Gradually luxury in all its forms crept in. The sleeves grew wider and richer; the tunics were long enough to sweep the ground. The poor wore trousers, and laborers are sometimes represented as threshing whilst stripped to the waist.

In the first half of the thirteenth century there was little alteration, though the materials became richer through the use of velvet, sendel, sarcenet, tartan, gauze, silk woven with gold, chiefly brought in by returning crusaders. A curious head-gear was common, called a coif, and tied like a baby's cap under the chin. The peasantry seem to have worn a tunic of varying length, sometimes a cloak of rough skin, probably sheepskin, together with an occasional felt or cloth hat. Women at the Conquest wore a kirtle reaching to the knee over a longer tunic of linen. The neck and bosom were not exposed; no attempt was made to display a slender waist, nor had their heads any covering but the hood. But here changes in favor of greater beauty and luxury rapidly crept in; the bodice was cut and laced in order to show the figure, jewelry became quite the fashion, and of course also earrings; the hair,

which at first was worn in two long plaits brought over the shoulders and elaborately intertwined with threads or ribbons, was, in the reign of Henry III, gathered up and confined in a caul or net sometimes made of gold thread. The sleeves were worn so tight that they were often laced or sewn on the arm; other garments were the chemise, coverchief, handkerchief, wimple, cape, mantle, coat, surcoat, frock, stays and aprons. Lastly, in order better to ensnare the manly heart, the hair was bleached, the eyes were painted, and bleeding and fasting were resorted to in order to give a pale and languishing appearance.

Up to the middle of the fourteenth century, the dress of the laborer underwent little or no change, but that of the higher classes suffered considerable modifications. The women now wore a veil over the caul, confined sometimes by a coronet or else by pins; also a sort of half mantle secured across the breast with a cord, whilst the long trailing dresses still continued to excite the laughter of the satirists.¹ Male dress was usually a long gown reaching to the feet, and sometimes clasped around the waist with a girdle, long leggings or stockings richly worked with gold threads, or else a tunic reaching to the knee. The materials were extremely various, both as to texture and color, since we are told that the English soldiers "were cloathed all in cotes and hoods, embroidered with floures and branches very seemlie," in derision of which the Scots said :

"Longbeards, hartless; painted hoods, witlesse;
Gaie cotes gracelesse, make England thriftlesse."

Within another century fine woollen cloth was at the disposition even of the peasantry, while in the higher classes luxury reached such a height that Parliament felt itself called upon to regulate it by sumptuary acts. Among women the sleeves grew long and tighter, tight-lacing increased, and the waists were worn much longer than at present. Buttons were

¹ "I have heard, says one, of a certain woman whose white robes dragged on the ground and raised a dust as high as the altar and the crucifix. When, however, she would leave the church and lifted up her train on account of the dirt, a certain holy man saw a devil laughing, and adjured him to tell why he laughed, who said: A companion of mine was just now sitting on that woman's train and using it as if it were his chariot; when, however, the woman lifted up her train my friend was shaken off into the dirt, and that is the cause of my laughing."

the rage, sometimes as many as thirty-two being worn on each arm. A close-fitting jacket also came into vogue. Later on (c. 1420) the waists and sleeves were shortened; buttons were no longer in such demand; the hair had puffed out on both sides and when covered with the mantle looked like horns.¹ This style gave way to steeple cap or butterfly head-dress. Finally the gown was cut low so as to display the necklaces then in vogue.

Male attire was even more luxurious and ridiculous; the sleeves grew longer², the long gown even trailed behind and was cut at the edges into all sorts of fantastic shapes. Some noblemen possessed no less than 250 suits; Richard II is said to have had a suit of cloth of gold and precious stones valued at 30,000 marks; and another prince is said to have worn a garment of blue satin full of small eyelet holes at every one of which hung the needle and silk with which it had been sewn. The hat consisted of a thick roll of stuff wound around the head like a turban, having attached to it a long string of cloth by which it might be fastened to the girdle and the hat then thrown back over the shoulder when not worn. Later on real hats were coming into use, with high crowns, little or no brim and a feather; the hose grew quite tight, the coat ridiculously short, and bolstering or stuffing was in fashion. Originally the Normans shaved not only the entire face but as well the back of the head, allowing the rest of the hair to grow long. Later on they nourished their heads like the Anglo-Saxons, and in the fifteenth century wore their hair not only long but curled.

This brings us to the end of the Middle Ages, where we can close this subject by noticing a few other miscellaneous cus-

¹ Of which the satirist said:

"Clerkes record, by great authority,
Horns were given to beasts for defence;
A thing contrary to femininity,
To be made sturdy for resistance,
But arch wives, eager in their violence,
Fierce as tigers for to make affray,
They have despite, and act against conscience,
List not to pride, then horns cast away."

² "Now hath this land little neede of broomes
To sweepe away the filth out of the streete,
Since wide sleeves of pennlesse grooms
Will it up licke, be it drie or weete."

toms. Marriage seems to have been, as with us, rather the outcome of mutual affection than of any previous arrangement of the parents. Of course it was celebrated in the church, followed by feasting and dancing at home, then, sometimes the young couple were ushered into the bridal chamber by their friends, the priest blessing the couch with holy water. After death the corpse was buried sometimes merely in a shroud, more often in a rectangular coffin. The strict observance of retiring to bed at the ringing of the curfew bell about 8 o'clock was due to the Conqueror, who thus sought to prevent any secret gatherings of the conquered. After the Conquest we also have the custom of going to bed naked, which died out in good society only at the dawn of the sixteenth century. As to names, what strikes one as rather queer is the rarity of the name "Mary," whilst the influence of the baptizing priest is easily detected in such Latin names as Christina, Johanna, Petronilla, Annabilla (Annabel), Theophania (or Tiffany), Massanda, Fynea, Desiderata, Massilia, Auncelia (Celia), Godiyeva. Perhaps of all names the most popular were Lucy, Alice, Margaret, and above all Mathilda or Maud, so common amongst the Norman princesses. A queer custom regarding infants is seen in the life of St. Thomas a Becket, who was placed, when an infant, in one side of a scale, the other side being loaded with costly gifts until a sum equal to the infant's weight was reached, which was then handed over to the priest as a fee, just as to-day the god-father is accustomed to make an offering of money after baptism.

IX. DOMESTIC RELATIONS.—Husband and wife were mutual helpers. Woman was not a slave but the housewife and capable of conducting the establishment in the absence of her husband; she had her meals with her husband; was his constant companion at home and entertained his guests in his absence. In fact the woman of the wealthier classes occupied a position quite similar to that of a Southern matron before the war. The whole internal administration of the house fell largely into her hands. She was to look after her maidens of good degree and teach them housewifery, spinning and embroidery, to love her husband and win his love through gentleness, to see that the servants were not lazy, to keep her own

keys, to attend to the sick, finally to give what instruction she could to her children :

"And if thi children been rebel, and wol not them lowe (submit)
If any of them mysdoth, nouthur banne hem ne blowe (neither curse nor scold).
But take a smert rodde and bete hem on a rowe
Til thei erie mercy: and be of her gilt aknowe."

In other words she was to spare her tongue and temper but not the rod.

Of course the father looked after the young men when they came to that age, when the latter so sorely need the advice of an old and wise head, as appears from the following counsel given in a poem of the fifteenth century by the "Wise Man to His Son." The archaic spelling is not always given here :

"And son, if thou wilt have a wife
Take her not for covetise,
But wisely enquire of all her life
And take heed by mine advice,
That she be meek, curteous and wise ;
Though she be poor, take thou no heed,
And she will do thee more good service
Than a richer, when thou hast need.

For it is better with rest and peace
A mells meete of homely fare,
Than for to have an hundred mees (dishes)
With grumbling and with much care :
And therefore learn well this lore
If thou wilt have a wife with ease ;
For riches take her never the more.
Though she would thee both fesse and cesse
(enfeoff thee with lands and goods).

* * * * *

Were people as happy in the Middle Ages as to-day? Did they enjoy the temporal goods of life with the same zest as the moderns? In answering this question one must keep in view certain preliminary notions.

1st. Earthly happiness is not something absolute, which can come to man only when placed in certain fixed conditions. It is something relative, which can gladden his heart under almost any conditions. A Laplander might be infinitely happier and therefore "better off" with his stomach gorged with whale blubber than one of our millionaires whom satiety has rendered indifferent to the most tempting delicacies collected from all climes.¹ Hence it seems unnecessary to ask if people

¹ As a thirteenth century rhymester puts it:

"Saepe vivunt gratius rebus destituti,
Sub exili tegete lateris aut luti,
Quam in regum domibus mollibus induti."

—Pol. Songs of England (Ed. T. Wright, 1890), p. 35.

in the Middle Ages were as happy as we are now. They certainly could have been, and we see no reason for doubting that they actually were so. Mediæval Englishmen were doubtless happier than their descendants, since the term "Merry England" hardly chimes in with that new and ominous term descriptive of modern conditions—"Darkest England."

2d. By "modern times" we may mean either *all* the period elapsed since the close of the Middle Ages, in which case, as we shall see further on, the latter can compare even more than favorably with the former except in one or two portions; or it may be taken to denote the actually existing period, in which case it seems safe to say that although in general conditions for physical comfort are vastly more favorable now, yet on certain lines there appears very little or no improvement. In two directions particularly has there been little if any progress—in food and clothing. Apparently both poor and rich were in the past just as comfortably clothed and as well fed. As regards home amusements anyone acquainted with the life of our American poor farmer knows how utterly unartistic and dull an affair it is. On the other hand, progress has chiefly been made in the construction and furnishing of dwelling-houses. The homes of even the wealthy were formerly at best only uncomfortable abodes, while the possession of gas, electricity, carpets, spring-beds, furnaces, and a hundred other comforts makes the homes of our poor vastly more comfortable than the huts of their peers in the Middle Ages. This, in spite of the assertion of our author (II, p. 396) that the mediæval industrial classes lived in "houses better indeed than the single rooms and hovels in our large cities which many English workmen inhabit, for they could at least escape into the fresh air."

But in one respect at least we compare downright unfavorably with mediæval times, and that is in the number of our paupers and landless workmen. True, until about the black death in 1348-9 there was practically no such thing as a free English laborer. Up to that time, and in fact long after it, the laborer was bound to the soil of his lord, and worked for him as well as his own family. But such a system had the advantage of making every free man a land-owner in greater or less degree, of practically ensuring him a living, and there-

fore of bringing pauperism to such a minimum as to be easily taken care of by individual charity. With us pauperism is universally prevalent, the average workman is without an assured living, and the average farmer overwhelmed with mortgages.

3d. Lastly, if by *modern times* we mean *all* of the period elapsed since the Reformation, then it seems safe to assert that, with one or two exceptions, such as the prosperous reign of Elizabeth and these latter years of the reign of Victoria, the poorer classes of England in the Middle Ages were certainly as well and perhaps better off than their descendants. Such a statement will not surprise those who are acquainted with English history of the past three hundred years. They know very well that the extraordinary high level of material civilization is separated from an infinitely lower one by hardly more than half a century. In this short period marvelous unparalleled progress has been made in science, popular education, and physical comfort. For those who still hug the venerable myth that this progress has been uniform and steady since the loosening of those complex forces and movements known as the Reformation, a few words in support of our statement may not be altogether useless.

The fifteenth century, although an unusually prosperous period, is, nevertheless, well within the Middle Ages; so that we are justified in taking it as an example. Now, we are told that in the reign of Henry VII "the masses of the English people were better supplied with the bare necessities of life *than in any other reign before that of Victoria* (op. cit. II, 530), an assertion which we would naturally consider thoroughly unwarranted were not the sad story of English poverty only too well known. Its beginning is simultaneous with, and a direct result of, the suppression of the monasteries by Henry VIII, for when the monastic lands, which were held by tenants on the stock and land-lease system, were confiscated and transferred to the "clutches of Henry's new and needy nobility, the stock was confiscated, sold off, the rent raised; the peasantry, as a result, were ruined and the foundations of English

pauperism successfully laid,"¹ so successfully, in fact, that even the good luck and ability of Elizabeth hardly brought back to the working classes a passing shadow of their mediæval prosperity.² The next two centuries witness a steady deterioration in the lot of the English laborer and artisan,³ until, at the end of the eighteenth century, we find the laborer in a condition of chronic misery.⁴ In fact a condition not above practical slavery came in, which, we may be sure, finds no counterpart in mediæval life, for with all its faults, feudalism by its very nature was the deadly enemy of slavery.

In a description of the laborer's lot in the region around Manchester in 1795, we are told that, owing to the employment of women and girls in mills they became thriftless wives and mothers, something one would look for in vain during the Middle Ages; that pauper children were regularly imported from the poorhouse into the mills, and from that moment doomed to slavery. Guarded in dark cellars until there was a demand for their work, the unhappy wretches were often forced to toil sixteen hours a day, by day and night, even on Sunday. They were given no wages, not even fed and clothed properly, confined in rooms, amidst the whirl of a thousand malodorous and overheated wheels, and forced to work by instruments of torture. They slept by turn in filthy beds, frequently without any discrimination of sexes. Those who tried to escape, or were suspected of it, had irons riveted to their ankles with long links reaching to the hip, in which chains all, young women and girls as well as boys, were compelled to sleep.⁵ Such a desperate state of affairs, somewhat but not much improved, continued to the middle of the present century, within the knowledge of men yet living. As late as 1844 we read of children and young people in factories being worked and beaten like slaves, of filthy homes where people huddled together like wild beasts, of girls and women working in the mines and dragging cars in places where no horses could

¹"Industrial History of England" by H. de B. Gibbins (London, 1895, p. 84.) A very elementary but yet clear and sound treatise. Those who wish for more elaborate works can consult Cunningham's "Growth of English Industry," and Ashley's "English Economic History and Theory."

²Ib., p. 105.

³Ib. p. 106.

⁴Ib., p. 120.

⁵Ib., p. 178 et seq.

go, actually harnessed and crawling along like beasts of burden. "Freedom they had in name; freedom to starve and die; but not freedom to speak, still less to act, as citizens of a free state."¹

With such overwhelming evidence before us, can we with any degree of accuracy assert that, taken as a whole, modern England in the three centuries of her existence has possessed a happier, more comfortable class of poor (the majority of the population of course) than did mediæval England, in spite of the latter's inexperience in the path of progress.

Far be it from us in these days to look with yearning eyes back to those ages and mourn over the passing of the "good old days." Nevertheless, even the most extravagant admirer of modern civilization will forbear to launch unreserved criticism upon a past age, when he recalls that universal education is largely a product of the last fifty or seventy-five years, that the echoes of the suffering white slaves of the English mining districts are yet lingering in the ears of men still living, that the English prison at the end of the last century had a striking similarity to the castles filled of old with "devils," that only about twenty per cent. of the American people avow themselves church-goers, while the London poor were, until the advent of the Salvation Army, in a condition of absolute religious neglect, that within this century political liberty meant, in England, the caprice of a landed aristocracy, and that a spirit of unrest and discontent is rife amongst the poorer classes in almost every civilized nation.

Let us put ourselves in imagination amid the difficulties then besetting the evolution of a renascent civilization, and we can then not refuse a tribute of admiration to the indomitable pluck with which mediæval Englishmen met and, to a large extent, overcame them. Those were truly the ages of faith, not merely of faith in God and his Church, but as well in the natural capacity of man to throw off the shackles which bound him, Prometheus-like, to the rock of despair. In this sense, therefore, "the observation of a well known modern writer on art, in noting the inability of the Middle Ages to see things as

¹ *Ib.*, pp. 192-93.

they really were, and the tendency to substitute on the parchment or the canvas conventional for actual forms, has a drift which he did not perceive. In itself unquestionably this defect is a real one, but in practice it possessed a counterbalancing advantage by supplying the necessary corrective to that bare literalism and realism which, in the long run, is fatal no less to sustained effort than it is to art."¹

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

¹ "The Great Pestilence," by Francis Aidan Gasquet, p. 217.

PRIMITIVE EPISCOPAL ELECTIONS—II.¹

While the Church in the East, almost from the beginning of the Christian Roman Empire, was engaged in defending her liberty against the civil power, and the orthodox faith against heretical innovations, the West, more fortunate in its rulers, and practical rather than theoretic in its tendencies, was scarcely affected by the change from persecution to prosperity.

ROME AND ITALY.

The emperors of the West, with few exceptions, declined to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs. Valentinian I merely congratulated the Romans on the election of Pope Siricius;² and when asked on another occasion to designate a bishop for the city of Milan he replied that not to him but to those specially favored by God's grace pertained that duty.³

In Italy bishops were chosen by the metropolitan on the recommendation of the clergy and the people. The earliest reference to the election of a bishop in that country is contained in a letter of St. Cyprian from which we learn that Pope Cornelius was made bishop by the votes of a majority of the Roman clergy and people.⁴ Whether the bishops of the

¹ In the preparation of this dissertation I have made constant use of the Acts of the Councils, both in Harduin and Mansi, as well as in Hefele's History of the Councils; of the Liber Pontificalis, the Liber Diurnus, the Pseudo-Isidoran Decretals (ed. Hinschius, Leipzig, 1863), Jaffé's Regesta RR. PP. (2d ed.), the "Monumenta Germaniae Historica," and Pitra's "Monumenta Juris Ecclesiastici Graecorum (Rome, 1869). Of the earlier fathers, the most useful has been Saint Cyprian (ed. Hartel, Vienna, 1871). I have been constantly indebted to the great works of Bingham, The Antiquities of the Christian Church, (Oxford, 1855), Thomas-sin, Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae disciplina circa beneficia, etc., (Venice, 1773), Bianchi, Pollizia della Chiesa (Turin, 1859), Phillips, Kirchenrecht (Regensburg, 1855-60), De Marca, De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii (Naples, 1771). The following books and articles have been of great use for special points: De Broglie, L'Eglise et L'Empire au Quatrième Siècle (Paris, 1860 sqq), Lünig, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts, (Strasburg, 1875), Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands (Leipzig, 1887 sqq), De la Tour, Imbart, Les Elections Episcopales sous les Carolingiens, (Paris, 1890) Diehl, Etudes sur l'administration Byzantine (Paris, 1888), Bayet, Les Elections Episcopales sous les Carolingiens, (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January, 1884), Duchesne, Vigile et Pelage (Ibid., 1884.) Funk, Die Bischofswahl im Christlichen Alterthum und im Anfang des Mittelalters, K. G. Abhdlg., I, pp. 22-39. cf. BULLETIN, Oct. 1897, pp. 404-420.

² Valent. Ep. II (ap. Constant. Epp. RR. PP.)

³ Theodoret, H. E., IV. 6

⁴ Ep. LV. 9 (Ed. Hartel) "Episcopatum non ex arbitrio nec extortum, sed de Dei qui sacerdotem facit voluntate susceptum." See BULLETIN, Oct. '97, p. 408.

suburbicarian sees, three of whom were privileged to consecrate the bishop of Rome, took any prominent part thus early in papal elections, is uncertain. In the interval between the death of a pope and the election of his successor, the Holy See was administered by the archdeacon, the archpriest, and the primicerius.¹ As early as the third century the Roman clergy were looked upon as the highest executive body in the Church, but it does not appear that the neighboring bishops shared their authority.²

Up to the fourth century the Roman bishop was sole metropolitan of all Italy. Milan and Aquileia were then elevated to the dignity of metropolitan cities, and, in the following century, Ravenna. The metropolitans of the two former cities were allowed to consecrate one another, as occasion demanded.³ The bishop of Ravenna was consecrated by the Pope.⁴ It is worthy of note that at a time when the eastern bishops were engaged in combating lay influence, their western brethren, so far from following their example, allowed the people, especially the more prominent among them, still greater privileges than they had yet enjoyed in the appointment of bishops.

The earliest indication of the increased powers of the laity is in a letter of Pope Siricius (384-398). Bishops, he says, are to be appointed according to his and the people's judgment.⁵ Pope Zosimus (417-418) sent a similar decree to the bishops of Gaul,⁶ and Celestinus I (422-432) enacted that, "no one may become bishop of a church whose members are unwilling to receive him. The consent of the clergy, of the *ordo* and people is necessary."⁷ Under the pontificate of Leo the Great (440-461) this mode of electing bishops became firmly established. When the clergy and the people were unanimous in their choice of a candidate, he must be preferred to all others. Should the votes

¹At least from the beginning of the seventh century. V. Liber Diurnus, No. LIX. (Ed. De Roziere.)

²St. Cyprian, ep. VIII.

³Pelagius I. ad Johann. Patricium, Jaffé, Regesta RR. PP. 983; Mansi, IX, 730.

⁴Liber Pontif. (ed. Duchesne) I. P. 360.

⁵Plebis et nostro iudicio comprobari. Jaffé l. c. 386. Cfr Hinschius: Decretales pseudo-isidorianae, Lipsiae, 1863.

⁶Migne P. L. XX. 642, 674.

⁷Nullus inavitus detur episcopus; cleri, plebis, et ordinis consensus et desiderium requiratur. Jaffé, 369.

be divided the metropolitan decides, but even here he was restricted. A candidate obnoxious to the people became thereby ineligible, and the metropolitan was forbidden to choose such an one lest the people despise or hate their bishop.¹

An official peculiar to the West and in an especial manner to Italy, was the *Visitor*. He was usually the bishop of a diocese adjoining the vacant see, appointed by the Pope or metropolitan to act as provisional administrator, and to preside at the election of a new bishop. When the decree of election was made out and signed by the electors, the *Visitor* forwarded it to the metropolitan, together with his own report, and awaited the issue.²

The papal instructions referred to assign no part to the suffragan bishops, and apparently they did not participate in the election of their colleagues. The metropolitan was the central figure and sole judge of the candidate's fitness, and not till the consecration, at which they assisted, do the suffragans appear.

When a metropolitan was to be elected the procedure was different. The remaining bishops of the province, united in synod, took the place of the metropolitan in regard to the candidate's nomination. The one selected, however, had to be confirmed by the pope in Italy, and by the exarch or primate in other parts of the Roman patriarchate.³

Apart from the Roman See, details relative to the election of bishops in Italy are not numerous. However, by comparing those texts which, in the letters of popes, give directions on this matter, we find substantially the same discipline in the fifth century under Leo the Great, and in the seventh under Gregory the Great.⁴

In Rome, where so many interests were dependent on the bishop, it was to be expected that, from time to time, modifications would be introduced. The bishop of Rome, in addition to his dignity as Head of Christendom, was, since the fall

¹ Cum ergo de summi sacerdotis electione tractabitur, ille omnibus praeponatur quem cleri plebisque consensus concorditer postularit. Leo M. ep. XIV. c. 5. (Migne P. L. LIV. p. 673). Cf. ep. X c. 6.

² Pelag. I ap. Mansi IX. 733; Greg. M. Epp. II. 25, 39, 43.

³ Leo M. ep. XIV c. 6; Greg. M. Epp. II, 25, 39, 43.

⁴ Compare the preceding references with Greg. M. Epp. V, 25, 26; II 16, 25, 37, 39.

of the western empire, the chief personage in Italy. In the period of panic following the downfall of Roman rule, the western bishops and clergy were everywhere staunch defenders of their people and of civilization; chief among them ranked the popes. Even under the exarchate, the imperial deputies were often reluctantly forced to rely on their support, and there is little doubt that, at any time from the reign of Justinian (527-565) to that of Constantine Copronymus (741-755), without the moral support of the Roman bishops the degenerate East Romans would have been unable to retain their hold in Italy. The importance of the papacy then having been so great, it is not surprising to meet occasionally in the period under review indications of a clash of interests. It would be, indeed, matter for wonder if there were not evidences of the kind, and the rarity of their occurrence shows the great influence which the Church exercised over all classes.

Outside the two disputed elections of Cornelius and Callistus, no other difficulties are known to have occurred in papal elections before the succession of Constantius to the undivided empire (350). This prince favored the Arians and Pope Liberius, for his refusal to adapt his theology in accordance with the views of the imperial theologians, was expelled from Rome and remained three years in exile.¹ Meanwhile the Archdeacon Felix, who, with the rest of the Roman ecclesiastics, had sworn to remain faithful to his bishop, had himself consecrated and received the support of the clergy. But the people were more loyal, and succeeded after a time in forcing the emperor to restore Liberius.² The election of Damasus was also, for a short period, disputed, but as the majority of the clergy and laity supported him, his competitor Ursicinus was exiled by the Emperor Valentinian I.³

The next contested election occurred in the year 418, and was due apparently to the ambition of the Roman deacons. From the days of the Apostles the influence of the deacons had been always great; as the Church increased in numbers the importance of their order grew in proportion. This was

¹Sozom. H. E., IV. II; Athanas. Hist. Arian, ad monach. c. 40, 75.

²Cfr. Migne P. L. XXVII p. 683; XIII p. 81.

³Lib. Pontif. I., 212; Soc. II, 27; IV, 29.

especially the case after the middle of the third century. With the spread of the Church outside the city of Rome, the priests, who up to this time usually lived with the bishop, began to reside within the limits of the new parishes. Their parochial duties naturally had the first claim on their attention, and so, gradually, they lost their standing as councillors of the bishop, and knew little about the administration of the diocese.¹ The primary duty of the deacons, on the other hand, was to look after the temporal possessions of the Church, and they were thus brought into intimate relations with the bishop. They were the eye and the ear of the bishop—the executors of his commands.² The archdeacon, in particular, was the bishop's *alter ego*, and exercised a jurisdiction nearly corresponding to that of vicars-general today.

Another result of their close relations to the bishop was that they were always well known to the community, especially to the prominent Christians, and later to the civil authorities. In those days when the *honorati*, or distinguished citizens, and the people exercised considerable influence on ecclesiastical affairs, it was but natural that, when a bishop was to be elected, the deacon's claims would receive far greater attention than those, however strong, of a priest who was little known outside his own parish.

In the Roman Church previous to the date at which we have arrived, almost all bishops were elevated from the ranks of the deacons; but the ambition of this order aroused so strong an opposition among the priests that for a long time a bitter war for supremacy was carried on between the two orders. The twentieth canon of the council of Laodicea forbids a deacon to sit in presence of a priest without the latter's permission, and this prohibition is but the renewal of a still more ancient one.³

In the early part of the fifth century the power of the Roman deacons seems to have been on the decline. For, after the death of Pope Zosimus (418), led by the archdeacon Eulalius and supported by partisans, they seized the Lateran basilica,

¹ Though taking no very active part in administrative affairs the influence of the Roman priests in matters of doctrine was always great. St. Cypr. Ep. IX.

² Apost. Constit. II, c. 30, sqq., 53 (ap. Pitra, Jus eccles. Graecor. I, 178 sqq. and 207.)

³ Ap. Const. II, c. 57.

and, excluding the priests with the exception of a few favorable to their pretensions, elected Eulalius bishop. Meanwhile the priests elected Boniface, who was consecrated in presence of nine bishops. The prefect of Rome, Symmachus, supported Eulalius, but on the appeal of Boniface to the Emperor Honorius, both claimants were set aside until a council could decide on their titles. Eulalius, however, disregarded an imperial order forbidding both parties to celebrate Easter at Rome, and was, in consequence, expelled, while his rival was acknowledged as legitimate bishop.¹

But the supporters of Eulalius, though defeated for the moment, did not give up the contest. A year after his election Boniface was seized with a grave illness, and, anticipating his death, parties began to agitate. The pope recovered unexpectedly and perceiving the gravity of the situation, solicited the emperor to adopt measures for the prevention of a schism after his death.² Honorius responded by a law which declared that, in the event of a double election, both competitors were to be set aside, and only he who was unanimously elected should be recognized as bishop.³

Celestine, the successor of Boniface, was, according to St. Augustine, elected without opposition, and the *Liber Pontificalis* bears him out so far that it makes no mention of any want of unanimity.⁴ Still this accord could hardly have been quite complete, for a law of Valentinian III threatens with severe penalties those who separate themselves from communion with this pope.⁵

From this time to the last quarter of the fifth century papal elections were carried on regularly; but with the Ostrogoth kings the ideas of Constantinople for the first time appear in the West. Odoacer, through his pretorian prefect, Basilius, forbade the Romans to elect a bishop without his confirmation.⁶ His successor Theodoric presumed to send a *Visitor* to Rome in order to examine into the charges preferred against Pope

¹ Baronius. Ann. 418-419; cfr. Lib. Pont. I, p. 228, note 1.

² Jaffé 353.

³ Cfr. Can. Victor D. 97.

⁴ St. Aug. ep. CCLX.; L. P. I. 230.

⁵ Qui pravis suasionibus a venerabilis papae sese communione suspendunt, quorum schismate plebs etiam reliqua vitatur. Cod. Theod. XVI, v. 62.

⁶ Hard. II. p. 977.

Symmachus (498-514) by the senators Festus and Probinus.¹ This interference, however, must be attributed to the imprudent action of the Romans, who, a little previously, had selected Theodoric as umpire to decide a contested election. The circumstances were as follows: After the death of Pope Anastasius II (498), the emperor Zeno commissioned Festus to procure the election of a pope favorably inclined towards his instrument of union called the *Henoticon*. The archpriest Laurence was found to lean towards the views of Zeno, and, on that account, received the support of Festus. The majority, however, declared for Symmachus. Both parties appealed to Theodoric, who decided in favor of the latter.² Symmachus reigned four years without opposition, when a schism headed by Festus and Probinus, broke out. The Pope was charged with various crimes, and a second appeal to Theodoric was the result. A *Visitor* was sent to Rome by him to investigate the charges, and this official having sided with the schismatics, four years of disorder ensued. Theodoric then interfered directly and Laurence was finally ejected.³

In a synod held at Rome in 502 the pretensions put forward by Odoacer a quarter of a century previous, were repudiated.⁴ Three years earlier another synod, under the same pope, took measures to prevent further appeals to secular princes, and, as far as possible, obviate the danger of a future schism. To this end the decree of the Emperor Honorius, already referred to, was substantially adopted, and thus became a law of the Church. Henceforth a majority of the votes of the clergy was to be decisive.⁵

Felix IV (526-530) was elected by command of King Theodoric.⁶ Before his death, Felix, it appears, designated his successor in the person of the Archdeacon Boniface, and by this act precipitated the danger he meant to avert. Vigorous protests

¹ L. P. I. 260.

² Theod. Lect. II. 17 (Migne P. G. LXXXVI p. 192 sq.); L. P. I. p. 260.

³ L. P. I. 260 sq. cfr. note 10 p. 264.

⁴ Hard. II, c. 1, 2, p. 917.

⁵ Mansi, VIII, 232.

⁶ Ex jussu Theodorici, cfr. L. P. I. 260, n. 5. Athalaric, the successor of Theodoric, congratulated the Roman senators on their obedience in this matter. Cassiodor. Varior. VIII, 15.

were made on all sides against a course so uncanonical.¹ Sixty priests, and very probably a proportionately large number of the *honorati* and people, elected Dioscorus. In the Roman council of 499, sixty-seven priests were present, so we may conclude that the number of that order who adhered to Boniface was not great. Fortunately for the peace of the Church, Dioscorus died twenty-three days after his election, and Boniface was reluctantly acknowledged as pope.² This pope was the first, unfortunately not the last, among the successors of St. Peter, who resorted to the undignified and unchristian revenge of anathematizing the memory of a man who, were it not for his sudden death, would probably be reckoned among the bishops of Rome.³

Regardless alike of the warning conveyed by his own designation and of the true interest of the Church, Boniface appointed the deacon Vigilius his successor; but the vigorous opposition of the clergy compelled him to revoke the decree of nomination, which he himself publicly burned.⁴

The hopes of Vigilius were for the moment blighted, but a few years later, another opportunity of reaching the papal throne presented itself. Pope Agapitus (535-536) was accompanied on his journey to Constantinople by Vigilius, who soon became a special favorite of the Empress Theodora. The Monophysites had no more staunch and powerful supporter than the empress, and, after the death of Agapitus, she conceived the design of placing one favorable to her tenets in the chair of St. Peter. Vigilius was the candidate of her choice, and, blinded by ambition, he was profuse in promises. Furnished with letters to Belisarius, he returned to Italy, but found Silverius, who had been appointed by Theodoric, occupying the place he had hoped to fill. Silverius, however, was soon got rid of. Charges were made out and preferred against him, and he expiated in exile the weakness which made him accept his own uncanonical election. Vigilius immediately assumed his place.⁵

¹ Can. Ap. LXXVI (ap. Hefele I, p. 823); Syn. Antioch. In encaenis Can. 23.

² L. P. I. 281.

³ For text of condemnation cfr. L. P. I. 282, n. 8.

⁴ L. P. I. 281. Cf. Holder, *Die Designation der Nachfolger durch die Päpste*, Freiburg, 1892, pp. 29-41.

⁵ Liberat. Brev. 22 (Migne P. L. LXVIII, 1039); L. P. I. 290, 292 sq.

The Byzantine conquest of Italy was, to say the least, of no advantage to ecclesiastical discipline in that country. The right of confirming papal elections was immediately assumed,¹ and a sum of money exacted in return for the imperial assent.² However, owing to the weakness of the exarchate and the strength of the Roman Church, imperial confirmation was little more than a matter of form. It was a concession somewhat akin to the modern right of exclusion against any particular cardinal allowed to some European sovereigns. It may be suspected even that the election tax was the most important part of the privilege. The straits to which the exarchs were sometimes reduced for want of money are evident from occasional references in the *Liber Pontificalis* to the manner in which their exchequer was replenished.³ No notice of elections is made by the author of the *Liber Pontificalis* from Pelagius II (1-590) to Benedict II (684-685), and since he never fails to mention disputes or departures from the regular mode of elections, we may safely conclude that in the intermediate period Roman bishops were elected in the usual manner.

In the life of Benedict a new electoral factor appears. A letter addressed by the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus to the clergy, people, and army (*exercitus Romanus*) at Rome, dispensed with the usual imperial confirmation. The *Exercitus Romanus*, a sort of militia organized for the defence of the city,⁴ is first referred to in the life of Pope Severinus, and in a manner by no means creditable to it.⁵ Henceforward we shall see its members exercising considerable influence on Italian affairs, and occasionally in Roman elections. Italians by birth⁶ and sympathy, they had little affection for the Byzantine, and on this account they had no small share in rendering nugatory the attempts of the latter to enslave the Roman Church.

Whether the *divales jussiones* of Constantine Pogonatus

¹ L. P. I. 309, Pelagius II. (579-590) was ordained *absque jussione principis*, because at the time Rome was besieged by the Lombards.

² This tax was dispensed with by Constantine Pogonatus on the demand of Pope Agatho. L. P. I. 354.

³ L. P. I. 328 and 372.

⁴ Cfr. Diehl: *Etudes sur l'administration Byzantine*, Paris, 1888.

⁵ Led by the *Cartularius Mauritius* they plundered the Lateran basilica. L. P. I. 328.

⁶ Such is the opinion of Duchesne, L. P. I. 329, note 1.

restored absolute electoral freedom or merely transferred to the exarch the right of confirmation, is uncertain.¹ The election of John V (685-686) seems to have been entirely free²; but that of his successor, Conon, was made known, *ut mos est*, to the exarch.³ Conon was not chosen without opposition. The clergy at first elected the archpriest Peter, and the army a priest named Theodorus. Negotiations carried on for some time between the two parties proved fruitless, and the clergy, thereupon, with the *primates exercitus*,⁴ united on Conon. The soldiers after a few days tendered their submission to the new pontiff.

The following year Theodorus again appears as an aspirant to the pontifical throne, but with new supporters. On this occasion the people were divided into two factions, one of which chose Theodorus, the other Paschalis. The clergy, however, with the "*primates iudicum et exercitus Romani militiae*" ignored both candidates and elected Sergius.⁵ Paschalis, thereupon, induced the exarch, John Platyn, by the promise of a large sum of money, to interfere in his behalf; but finding all parties now in favor of Sergius, Platyn was content to extort from the legitimate pope the gold promised by the pretender, and took his departure.⁶

Thus the Roman Church, with little variation in its discipline, reached the end of the seventh century. During this period, however, some of the consequences of Byzantine occupation and of Byzantine heresy, may be gathered from occasional hints in the *Liber Pontificalis*, and from other sources more or less reliable.

Ravenna, as we have seen, was erected (430) into a metropolitan see, and about the same time (433-450) had as bishop the eloquent Peter Chrysologus. As a metropolitan see, however, Ravenna was one of an unique kind. Its suffragan dio-

¹ Duchesne, L. P. I. 364, n. 4, holds the latter opinion; Phillips, *Kirchenrecht* V. 758 and De Rozière, *Liber Diurnus* P. XIX, the former.

² L. P. I. 366 ³ Ibid, 368,

⁴ L. P., I. 368. "Omnes iudices una cum primatibus exercitus pariter ad ejus salutem venientes." The terms *iudices* and *primatus exercitus* are not to be taken in their literal signification. They were applied vaguely to various Byzantine officials. Cfr. Diehl, *op. cit.*, p. 313 sq.

⁵ L. P. I. 371. ⁶ L. P. I. 372.

ceses were detached from the Milanese province, but over the bishops in its immediate neighborhood it had no jurisdiction. Moreover, as one of the suburbicarian sees, it was itself suffragan to Rome, and its bishop was confirmed and consecrated by the pope.¹

While Ravenna remained an ordinary Italian city this subjection of its bishops caused no difficulty; but after it had become the capital of the exarchate, eastern ideas of independence and the haughty tone of the patriarchs of Constantinople were speedily caught by its prelates.

The first symptom of rebellion appears in the refusal of Maurus of Ravenna to attend a Roman Council (649) under Pope Martin. Later on (666) the same bishop obtained from the emperor the privilege of being autocephalous, that is, free from the metropolitan authority of Rome.² His successor was, therefore, consecrated by three of his suffragans, but according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, he afterwards renounced the pretended privilege.³ It was finally withdrawn by the imperial authority at the instance of Pope Leo II (682-683). Damianus was, as of old, consecrated at Rome by Pope Sergius (687-701), and Felix by Pope Constantine (708-715).⁴ The latter, however, refused to sign the *cautio*, a document which suburbicarian bishops had to subscribe after their consecration.⁵ His pride was afterwards humbled by the Emperor Justinian II who had his eyes put out.⁶

The city of Aquileia which had fallen under the power of the Lombards in 568, had also, during the seventh century, frequent quarrels with the popes. A schism arose (557) on the occasion of the condemnation of the famous Three Chapters, which was extinguished in part under Pope Honorius (625-638), but did not entirely disappear till the reign of Sergius I (687-701).⁷

From the beginning of the eighth century to the year 767, no

¹ Cfr. L. P. I., c. XXIX, note 1.

² Mon. Germ. Scrip. Longob. p. 349.

³ L. P. I. 348. Agnellus denies this but contradicts himself by saying that Reparatus decreed: "Ut in tempore consecrationis non plus quam octo dies Roma electus moram invertat." Ibid. p. 349, note 5.

⁴ L. P. I. pp. 376 and 389.

⁵ L. P. I. 389, cfr. p. 393, n. 2.

⁶ l. c.

⁷ L. P. I. 323 and 376.

difficulties seem to have arisen with regard to the election of the popes. At the latter date, however, an event took place which, in the light of after occurrences, may be regarded as foreshadowing that enslavement of the papacy which produced such bad results in the ninth and tenth centuries.

During the last illness of Pope Paul I (757-767), a certain Toto, duke of Nepi, with his brothers, Passivus and Paschalis, attempted to capture Rome, with the intention of putting the pope to death and placing their brother Constantine in the papal chair. Failure attended their first efforts, but a second endeavor was more successful and Constantine was installed in the place of Paul who, in the meantime, had died. Constantine remained a year in possession of his usurped honors before he was expelled by the Lombards. The advantage to the Church was, however, at first merely a change of masters; for the Lombards endeavored to intrude a monk named Philip into the papal chair. The attempt was frustrated by the courage and skill of the Primicerius Christopher, and, in a general assembly of the clergy and people, the Romans again upheld their ancient right of free election by the unanimous choice of Stephen III (768-772).¹

A curious fact in the history of papal elections is the succession, during the latter part of the seventh, and thence on to the middle of the eighth century, of several popes of Eastern origin. The series begins with John V (685), who was followed by Conon, a Thracian; Sergius, a Syrian; John VI and John VII, Greeks; Sisinnius and Constantine, Syrians. An interruption was caused by the election of Gregory II (715-731), a Roman, but from the latter date to the year 752 the Roman Church was ruled by Gregory III, a Syrian, and Zachary, a Greek.

To account for an occurrence so uncommon, it has been conjectured that during this period the influence of the exarchs was paramount. This hypothesis, however, is not supported by facts. For had the imperial deputies been of so great weight in Roman affairs, we would naturally expect to find subserviency in the popes chosen by their instrumentality. This is far

¹ L. P. I. 468 sqq; Mansi XII. 717.

from being the case. The first two of the series reigned but a year each. Sergius (687-781) refused to confirm the Trullan synod, and when, in obedience to the imperial order, the Protospatharius, Zacharias, proceeded to arrest the pope, in order to send him prisoner to Constantinople, the latter was defended by the Italian militia. Zacharias escaped the vengeance of the soldiers only by the intercession of Sergius.¹ John VI (701-705) was also threatened by another exarch, but, like his predecessor, he interfered to save the life of the imperial officers.² John VII (705-707), Sisinnius (708), and Constantine (708-715), notwithstanding the pressure brought to bear on them, also refused to sanction the Trullan synod. Gregory III (731-741) was as staunch an opponent of Leo the Isaurian and iconoclasm as the Roman Gregory II (715-731)³, and Zacharias, the last pope of Eastern origin, followed in the footsteps of his predecessors.

A more natural explanation of the election of orientals may be had in their superior qualifications for the papal office. The Eastern ecclesiastics, at this period, were far in advance of their Western brethren in theological knowledge. Since the fall of the Western Empire the Latins were constantly engaged in defending themselves against barbarian incursions, and consequently learning declined. Nor did the establishment of the exarchate leave the popes free from temporal cares. The government of the Byzantine rulers was always weak and unable to cope with the warlike Lombards. Gregory the Great complains that he was as much bishop of these latter as of the Romans, from the fact that their restless activity brought them repeatedly to the gates of Rome in search of plunder.⁴ Such a state of things was not favorable to the advancement of learning.

The colony of orientals on the other hand grew steadily. Orthodox bishops, priests, and inferior ecclesiastics, flying before Mussulman invasion or imperial persecution for the faith of which Rome was the strongest bulwark, naturally directed their footsteps to the center of Christendom. The result was that Greek was as commonly spoken in Rome as Latin. Pope

¹ L. P. I. 373, no. 161.

² L. P. I. 415, no. 140.

³ L. P. I. 383, no. 165.

⁴ Greg. M. Ep. I. 31.

Leo II was acquainted with both tongues, and Sergius, John VII, and Gregory III were especially noted for their learning. The constant intercourse, too, with the Byzantine functionaries demanded a bilingual pope, and such men were at hand in the many monasteries of eastern monks established at Rome.¹

These conditions are sufficient to account for the line of eastern popes, whose election conferred honor alike on East and West; on the former for the manner in which they upheld the traditions of the Roman Church; on the latter for choosing men irrespective of nationality, in whom they recognized superior capabilities for the defence of the Church against Byzantine treachery or sophistry.

GAUL.

The earliest references to episcopal elections in Gaul date from the fifth century. A letter of Pope Celestine I (422-432) to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne I and II, declares that the consent of the clergy, the people, and the *ordo*, or more prominent members of the community, is required for the valid election of a bishop.² Leo the Great (440-461) and Hilarius (461-468) issued decrees to the same effect.³ During the Gallo-Roman period the part taken by the metropolitan corresponded with that of the popes in Italy. His was the final *Judicium*. The *Visitor* was also designated by him.⁴

Under the Merovingian kings these privileges, while nominally in existence, were generally ignored; and the metropolitan's share in the appointment of his suffragans consisted in the consecration of the royal candidate.⁵

From the papal decrees referred to, it is evident that the part taken in elections by the Christian community was as great in Roman Gaul as in Italy. The results were not always edifying, either in the candidates chosen, or in the manner of choosing, as we learn from a writer who is our chief authority on this subject.

Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont (472-488), relates

¹ For an account of these monasteries see Diehl op. cit. p. 254.

² Jaffé Reg. RR. PP. no. 369.

³ Op. cit. 434, 556.

⁴ Op. cit. 764; Hinschius, "Decretales pseudo-Isidorianae," Lipsiae, 1863. p. 637.

⁵ Formulae Marculfi I, 5, 6, ap. Mon. Germ. Hist., ed. Trumer.

the history of an election which took place in the city of Bourges, at a time when he was the only bishop left in the province, his colleagues having fallen into the hands of the Visigoths. Notwithstanding the fact that a like fate threatened them, unanimity was far from existing among the citizens. Two benches were not enough to contain the numerous aspirants for episcopal honors. Bribery was the chief reliance of each,¹ but as no one could procure a majority of votes, all at length agreed to make Sidonius sole elector.

Accepting the responsibility, Sidonius took the opportunity of addressing the audience, and in eloquent discourse portrayed the evils attendant on popular election. "If we name a monk," he began, "were he comparable to Paul, Antony, Hilary, or Macarius, we shall immediately hear resounding in our ears the murmurs of a crowd of ignorant pigmies who cry: 'He whom he has chosen fulfils the office of an abbot, not of a bishop; he is much more fitted to intercede for souls before the celestial judge than for the life of the body before judges of this world.' . . . If we choose an humble man he will be called vile and abject; if we propose one of an ardent character, he is proud; if we take a man of small learning, his ignorance is a subject of ridicule. If, on the contrary, he is learned, that, too, is a reproach, as making him haughty. Is he severe, he is hated as cruel; indulgent, he is weak; and further, the people in their obstinacy, the clergy in their indocility, will with difficulty submit to the ecclesiastical discipline."² The result of such a state of things was that the bishops, at times, were compelled to wholly exclude clergy and people, and themselves elect their colleagues.³

The abuses of this period were not only continued under the Merovingians, but new and most serious ones were superadded. In this respect the Arian kings of Burgundy (413-534) were much more favorable to the maintenance of discipline than the greater number of the first line of Frankish kings.⁴

¹ Bribery was at that time very common in Gallic elections, v. Edict Glycerii ad Himeleon March 10, 473, ap. Phillips-Vering VIII, 237, no. 6.

² Sid. Apol. ep. VIII, 9 (Migne P. L. LVIII, 575.)

³ Id. ibid. p 531, ep. IV.

⁴ King Gundrich of Burgundy complained to Pope Hilary that Archbishop Mamertus of Vienna had consecrated a bishop for the city of Die which belonged to the province of Arles. Jaffé, 556.

In Gaul, as in Italy, the western emperors permitted electoral freedom; Clovis, on the other hand, was no sooner baptized than he assumed the right, not merely of confirmation, but of direct appointment, or regulation of elections, whenever he chose to do so. St. Waast was consecrated bishop of Arras by his order; St. Eptadius was, through his influence, made bishop of Auxerre; and on the occasion of an election at Verdun, the clergy and people were convened by the royal officers, a procedure which usually resulted in the presentation of the king's candidate who was rarely, if ever, rejected.¹

The sons of Clovis, Theodoric and Childebert, followed the example of their father. The fiction of an election, similar to that of the Anglican church to-day, was still gone through; the real choice was made by the civil authorities.² Lest the clergy and people, however, might presume to claim the right of choosing their bishop, a second uncanonical practice was introduced. It was an ancient custom in the Church, repeatedly confirmed by synods, that the bishop should be elected and consecrated in his cathedral city. Theodoric violated this law by permitting a bishop of Clermont, nominated by him, to be consecrated at Treves.³ Theodobald, king of Austrasia, granted a like privilege to another bishop of the same see.⁴ The metropolitan's right of appointing the *Visitor*, and, in case of a disputed election, deciding the matter at issue, was also usurped by the king.⁵

Great as was the actual power of the Frankish kings over the Church within their dominion, it did not receive any legal sanction for almost a century after the baptism of Clovis. The second, third, and fourth councils of Orleans (533, 538, 541) enacted laws for the regulation of elections, but the royal prerogatives in the matter were ignored.⁶ What the sentiments of the Gallic bishops really were on the subject of civil appointments to ecclesiastical benefices, we learn from a canon of the third council of Paris (557). This council, held in the reign of Childebert, a monarch well disposed to the maintenance of

¹ Acta SS. Feb. I. 792; July 28, V 76.

² Greg. Tur. Vita Patr. VI, 3.

³ Op. cit. l. c.

⁴ Greg. Tur. H. F. IV, 7.

⁵ Vita Sulpicii c. 12 (Mabillon Acta S.S. II. 178).

⁶ The right of confirmation was however, recognized by the fifth council of Orleans (549) in its tenth canon. Mansi IX. 126.

good discipline, decreed that bishops should be elected by the clergy and people. No one may, by the prince's command, or in any other manner against the will of the clergy and people, be made bishop. And should anyone presume to accept an uncanonical appointment, the bishops are forbidden to receive him as a colleague.¹

The best results were to be expected from the enforcement of this law, but as that depended on the will of the king, it soon, like similar previous laws, fell into disuse. A decade after the date of the council, it was violated by Clotaire I, who appointed Eumerius bishop of Xaintes. After Clotaire's death Eumerius was deposed by a provincial synod and a certain Heraclius chosen to succeed him. Heraclius thereupon set out to obtain the royal confirmation, but in place of it he was mounted on a car filled with thorns, and in this pleasant manner journeyed into exile. Eumerius was restored, and the bishops who deposed him were subjected to a heavy fine.²

A council held at Paris in 614 renewed the electoral canons of preceding synods,³ and these were approved by Clotaire II, but with amendments. If a bishop be taken from the palace, the king added, he shall be ordained because of his personal merit and learning.⁴ That is to say, whenever the king wishes to reward a favorite court chaplain, the superior qualifications, in the royal eyes, of such a person, entitle him to the next vacant bishopric. As an example, we find the king's treasurer, Desiderius, appointed some years later to the see of Cahors.

Among the evil results of royal nominations one of the worst was the systematic purchase of episcopal sees. The extensive civil authority conferred on bishops by the Roman law was confirmed by the Merovingian kings. Great estates, too, were usually attached to every diocese for the maintenance of the incumbent. Two such inducements, wealth and power, would be likely in any age to arouse the cupidity of the unscrupulous; and the Franks were by no means wanting in the ordinary failings of human nature. In fact, avarice was, perhaps, their chief weakness.

A concomitant abuse to that of simony was the transmission, in noble families, of certain sees from one member to another.

¹ Mansi IX. 746, can. 8.

² Greg. Tur. H. F. IV, 26.

³ Mansi X, 540, can. 2.

⁴ Per meritum personae et doctrinae. Ibid.

Gregory of Tours boasts that, with the exception of five, all his predecessors belonged to his family.¹ In Rhodéz we see grandson succeed grandfather, and a certain Chronopius, bishop of Perigueux, also received his see by way of inheritance.²

While it can hardly be concluded that this mode of transmission would generally lead to the elevation of unworthy incumbents; yet, when restricted to a single family, it is obvious that the convenience of that family would be a much greater consideration than the selection of one who would do honor to the office.

We have already seen that simony was not unknown in the latter days of the Western Empire, but at that period it was confined chiefly to promises made by ambitious aspirants. Under the Merovingians it assumed a more businesslike character. According to Gregory of Tours, it was practised as early as the reigns of Clovis' sons. Theodoric I (511-534) sold episcopal sees, and found purchasers among the clergy.³ A Syrian merchant was able to buy the bishopric of Paris.⁴ King Gunthram, who endeavored to check the abuse, was not always able to refrain from it.⁵ The decrees of councils⁶ were fruitless because not enforced. In the time of Gregory the Great it had grown to such an extent that scarcely an individual, he tells us, was elevated to sacred orders but by simoniacal means.⁷ Gregory's efforts in the cause of free and pure elections were tireless, but in Gaul little success awaited them.⁸ Queen Brunchild, on whose aid he relied, was notorious for her traffic in ecclesiastical benefices; and if she did not always receive compensation in money, her appointments were sometimes the gratification of a whim.⁹

Occasionally a ruler appeared more zealous for the Church's interests than the average. Gunthram belonged to this class.¹⁰ Dagobert I and Queen Bathildis followed in his footsteps¹¹ and

¹ H. F. V. 49. Polyocrates of Ephesus, cited by Eusebius, makes a similar boast.

² Migne P. L. LXXXVIII. 150 and 160.

³ Greg. Tur. Vit. Patr. VI. 3. ⁴ Id. H. F. X. 28.

⁵ Cfr. Phillips-Vering VIII. 258, n. 59.

⁶ II Orleans, c. 4; I Clermont, c. 2; V. Orleans, c. 10; Chalons, c. 10.

⁷ Jaffé, 1004. "Agnovi quod in Galliarum vel Germaniae partes nullus ad sacrum ordinem, sine commodi datione perveniat."

⁸ I. c. 1169, 1216, 1413, 1419.

⁹ A poor peasant whom she chanced to meet was recommended to her son, Theodoric II from whom he received the bishopric of Auxerre. Fredegar. Chron. IV, 13, 28.

¹⁰ The appointment of Desiderius is the only one in which he is charged with simony.

¹¹ Vita Eligii II, 1 (Boll. Jan'y 26, II, 740).

attempted reform; but similar examples are rare and transitory. The advent of a new monarch undid, in a short time, the reforms of one conscientious enough to depart from the time-honored policy of the Merovingian line of kings.

Another serious menace to ecclesiastical discipline in the kingdom of the Franks was the frequent elevation of laymen to the episcopate, without regard to the interstices demanded by the canons. In the fifth century bishops were regularly taken from two classes of men—noble Gallo-Romans who had previously held, in many cases, high civil offices, and monks from the isle of Lerins. To the former class belonged Sidonius Apollinaris, a relation of the Emperor Avitus, and Simplicius whom Sidonius, in the case already referred to, chose for metropolitan of Bourges; to the latter, Hilarius of Arles, Eucherius of Lyons and Caesarius of Arles.

While occasionally good results occurred to the Church from men of the former class, it was in the nature of things that the evil consequences would eventually more than counterbalance them. For, in the first place, a nobleman, long accustomed to look down upon the common people, and rule them with no gentle hand, is *a priori* an unlikely personage to fulfil the ideal of a Christian pastor. His education, too, such as it was, had as its end civil administration; so that when, having reached middle age, he looked around for a pleasant place to end his days *in otio cum dignitate*, it could hardly be hoped that he would become a zealous student of theology, pastoral, dogmatic, or moral.

Nevertheless, this first stage of lay-bishops, as they might be called, was by no means the worst. A conscientious man of good morals would, in some sense, meet the canonical requirements. But under the half-converted Merovingian princes, the transition from pious nobles to avaricious courtiers, and thence, as under Charles Martel, to soldiers, who enjoyed the revenues, without assuming the character of a bishop, was easily accomplished.¹

¹ Ep. Bonif. Jaffé Monum. Moguntiae III. 112, (Bibliotheca Rer. German.) "Maxima ex parte per civitates episcopales sedes traditae sunt laicis, cupidis ad possidendum, vel adulterati clericis, scortatoribus et publicanis, seculariter ad perfruendum."

Against this uncanonical mode of procedure, as well as the equally hurtful simony, the popes and Gallic councils contended with little result.¹ The interstices demanded by the more ancient canons were reduced in consequence. The fourth council of Arles permitted episcopal consecration a year after the reception of the tonsure, and in this was followed by the third and fifth of Orleans.² Even this period of probation was considered too long, and was rarely observed. Although unworthy motives were generally connected with the promotion of laymen to the episcopate, it must be admitted that the exigencies of the age sometimes made such promotions beneficial to the people. In the last days of the empire in Gaul, the bishops played a prominent part in its defence against the invaders, so that when a see fell vacant it was not unnatural that a pious soldier should succeed to it. Under the Merovingians, too, bishops were made *defensores civitatis*, and as such were accountable to the king.³ The result was that soldierly qualifications were deemed of more importance than priestly, hence the origin of mediæval soldier-bishops.

Perhaps the most useful means of preserving order in any particular and national branch of the Church is found in provincial and national synods. Gaul was, throughout the sixth century, especially noted for them;⁴ and, though not always able to carry out their decrees, the bare fact of their existence is proof that many good elements still survived. In the first half of the seventh century, synods were very rare. St. Boniface, writing to Pope Zachary in 742, says that for eighty years no synod had been held in France.⁵ This statement is not strictly accurate,⁶ but with the exception of the Parisian synod of 614, those held were of little importance.⁷ Worldly prelates who acquired their dignities by means that would hardly bear in-

¹ Jaffé ep. RR. PP. 566; Greg. M. ep. V. 53, 54; IV. C. of Arles can. 2; III. Orleans, can. 6; V. Orleans, can. 9. For examples of laics elevated to the episcopate cfr. Greg. Tur. H. F. VI. 7, 9, 38; VIII. 20, 22.

² Cfr. note 36, canons cited.

³ Greg. Tur. H. F. VII. 24.

⁴ Cfr. Hefele, "Conciliengeschichte, II p. 660 sqq.

⁵ Jaffé, Bib. Rer. Germ. n. 42, p. 112.

⁶ Synods were held in 588 and 590, Greg. Tur. H. F. IX, 10, and X, 8.

⁷ Mansi X, 539 sqq.

spection, were not likely to be zealous for the maintenance of an institution from which they had nothing to hope and much to fear.¹

All these disorders remained in the Gallic church till the time of St. Boniface. New life was infused by the great apostle of the Germans into the moribund canons, but after his death zeal again relaxed, though never to the extent of the seventh century. This was due to the watchfulness of the popes, who then began to exercise, in a manner more direct than heretofore, that authority over the whole flock of Christ, which was confided to them through the prince of the apostles.

SPAIN.

The earliest notices of episcopal elections in Spain reveal a discipline substantially the same as that which received the approbation of the Nicene fathers. The west Gothic kings, who ruled in Spain since the middle of the fifth century, were, as a rule, tolerant to the faith of their Catholic subjects, and rarely interfered with the carrying out of the Church's laws.²

The influence of bishops in the appointment of their colleagues, seems, as far as may be ascertained from the few references to this matter, to have been decisive. Two cases are recorded which point to this conclusion. The first is that of Sylvanus, bishop of Calahorra, who was reported to Pope Hilary by his colleagues of the province of Tarragona as ordaining bishops without consulting them.³ The second relates that a certain bishop Nundinarius, on the approach of death, expressed a wish that a chorepiscopus named Irenaeus should succeed him. The provincial synod of Tarragona confirmed the appointment, and, writing to the same pope in a manner which implied that this was by no means a new departure, asked his approval.⁴ To the Roman authorities, however, it seemed an abuse, *novum et inauditum*. Pope Hilary in his reply ordered Irenaeus to give up his see, and directed the clergy to elect another bishop, who was to be confirmed by the metropolitan.

As to the bishops appointed by Sylvanus, the pope decided that a strict compliance with the canons demanded their deposi-

¹ Greg. M. ep. IX, 106: "Nam plerumque etsi non amore justitiae, metu tamen examinis abstinetur ab hoc quod omnium notum est posse displicere iudicio."

² Cfr. Mansi VIII, 539; Gams, Kirchengeschichte von Spanien II, 54.

³ Mansi VII, 924. ⁴ Ibid, p. 982.

tion; but if they were not men who had been twice married, or mutilated, or persons who had done public penance, they might be allowed to rule their dioceses.¹

In the year 589, King Reccared became a convert to the Catholic faith. The king's example was followed by the greater part of his Arian subjects, and the acts of the third synod of Toledo (589), at which the union was effected, were signed by eight formerly Arian bishops.²

For a time all went well. Reccared himself usually refrained from things ecclesiastical, but with the progress of feudalism, the church of Spain shared the fate of her Gallic neighbor. Thus the twelfth synod of Toledo (681) takes it for granted that the king should appoint bishops. In the sixth chapter of its acts we are told that, owing to the delays occasioned by waiting for the provincial bishop's approval of the royal candidate, the archbishop of Toledo was empowered to give the required sanction in all cases, and himself perform the consecration. The new bishop was, however, required to present himself before his metropolitan within three months, under pain of excommunication.³

In the year 711, the greater part of Spain fell into the hands of the Saracens, and was henceforth, for seven centuries, known as the Caliphate of Cordova. For over a century after this conquest the Christians enjoyed comparative liberty in the practice of their religion. The Church in Arabian Spain was organized into twenty-three dioceses and three metropolitan sees; bishops were appointed without interference on the part of their secular masters. This *modus vivendi* was, however, rudely interrupted by a persecution, which began in 850 and continued for over a century. Yet the Christians, by their insults against the religion of Mohammed, were, in a great measure, accountable for a change of policy, which cost many of them their lives.⁴

ENGLAND.

The advocates of continuity of the Anglican Church to-day can appeal to at least one practice which they possess in com-

¹Ib. p. 926.

²Mansi IX, 977-1010.

³Mansi XI, 1033.

⁴Cfr. Hergenr. I, 753 sq.

mon with their Saxon ancestors; for the present mode of electing bishops in the Church of England is easily traceable to a time not very remote from the days of St. Augustine. The newly-converted kings of the Saxon heptarchy were no less active than their continental brethren in the affairs of the Church; unfortunately, it must be added, with results not very dissimilar.¹

St. Augustine appointed the first bishops among the newly converted Saxons,² but during the next half century, or down to the appointment by Rome of Archbishop Theodore (668), the civil authorities exercised arbitrary control in the appointment and deposition of bishops.³ Under Theodore, the choice of prelates was reserved to national synods, presided over by the primate, and afterwards it devolved for a time on the clergy and respectable laity of each diocese.⁴ The feudal system, however, put an end to real electoral freedom, and royal nominations became the rule.⁵

AFRICA.

From about the beginning of the fourth century, the Church in North Africa, up to that date deservedly famous, began to decline. Three causes contributed to bring about this result: the Donatist schism, the Arian heresy, and the Vandal conquest. The last event, which occurred in 429, was also the triumph of Arianism, for the Vandals had embraced that form of Christianity.

The period between 311 and 533, that is from the outbreak of the forementioned schism to the overthrow of the Vandal kingdom by Justinian's general, Belisarius, presents little of interest so far as concerns our subject. The Catholics were almost constantly persecuted by the Arian barbarians, and their bishops were in an especial manner objects of intolerance.

¹Bede III., 7.

²Lingard, *History of England*, vol. I. c. 2.

³Bede, l. c.

⁴Cfr. Lingard: *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, cap. II..

⁵Cfr. Ingulf apud Lingard op. cit. l. c. "A multis itaque annis retroactis nulla electio praelatorum erat mere libera et canonica; sed omnes dignitates tam episcoporum quam abbatum per anulum et baculum, regis curia pro sua complacentia conferebat." [The authenticity of Ingulf's Chronicle of Croyland has long been disproved.—EDITOR.]

After its re-establishment as a province of the Eastern Empire, episcopal elections in North Africa were subjected to the same vicissitudes as in the rest of the empire.

CONCLUSION.

From the foregoing summary of the facts relative to the appointment of bishops during the first eight centuries, it is seen that prior to the first council of Nice (325) uniformity, or an approach to it, existed in this matter throughout Christendom. After the union of church and state effected by Constantine, diverging tendencies are noticeable between East and West. In the former branch of the Church, the emperors, beginning with Constantius, took an active, and generally hurtful, interest in what related to dogma and discipline. And although many intrepid defenders of the faith illustrated the Orient, sycophants and courtier-prelates who nurtured the Caesaropapism of the emperors, were much more numerous.

The peculiar genius of the Orientals led them away from the practical development of Christianity for which the West was noted. Abstract speculations were more in keeping with their intellect, and drew them into a series of heresies which for centuries disturbed the Christian world. A second, and in its consequences no less dangerous, result of these religious divisions was that they called for the continual and often arbitrary interference of the Byzantine emperors in ecclesiastical affairs.

It was but natural that when the Christians first realized the strange phenomenon of a Christian emperor, they should give way to excess of joy; and that churchmen in particular should hesitate to offer even a slight opposition to a prince with so many good qualities as Constantine. The consequence was that, though the first Christian emperor rendered invaluable services to the Church, a seed of future difficulties was planted without opposition and almost without being noticed. Constantine, the Christian, was also the pagan *Pontifex Maximus*: it seemed quite proper that he should stand in the same relation to Christianity. Nor were opportunities of interfering in ecclesiastical matters slow in presenting themselves. Scarce was the edict of Milan promulgated, when he received the ap-

peal of the Donatists against the bishop of Carthage. The judges of inquiry were appointed by him, and, as they failed to end the difficulty, he convened a council under the presidency of Pope Melchiades, to whose decision the schismatics again refused submission. Finally, the parties were cited before his own tribunal, thus constituting a secular tribunal the court of last appeal. Heresy and schism in the fourth century, as in every stage of their history, must therefore suffer the odium of initiating and perpetuating recourse to the secular government.

The Arian heresy served to make a regular institution of what might otherwise have soon fallen into disuse. Constantius was easily swayed by his co-religionists, who, far from protesting against his usurped authority, encouraged him in his violent measures.¹ The orthodox prelates, on the other hand, maintained their independence. Pope Liberius suffered exile for his opposition to the emperor, and though weak for a moment, in a storm that shook the whole Church, endeavored to retrace his steps. The bishops of Egypt denounced the council of Tyre presided over by an imperial officer,² and the councils of Sardica and Milan followed their example in repudiating intermeddling in the Church's sphere.

Even thus early the Church begins to appear as two great branches. The long struggle against Arianism emphasized more and more the different genius of East and West. The West from the beginning was characterized by Roman talent for organization, discipline, and government. Rome itself, the centre of Christendom, was noted for its practical faith, which demonstrated its true comprehension of Christ's teaching. But the Orientals preferred speculating on philosophical subtleties, and, when their pride was not gratified by a general acceptance of their views, paganism was neither more cruel nor more treacherous. Little did it matter to the court bishops who filled the imperial ante-chambers that they were forging fetters by which the churches in their charge would be held in utter subjection to a despot's will.

Mansi II, 1290. St. Athanasius taunted the Oriental bishops with their failure to appear at a council presided over by Pope Julius, because they feared a Roman count would not preside, and that a guard of soldiers would not be present to secure them against imaginary dangers. Baron., *ad annum* 341, no. 3.

² Mansi, I. c.

As time went on, this subjection increased. The heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches made the interference of the emperors often necessary. Even the best among the Byzantine rulers frequently employed stern measures against their bishops, nor were they without justification. Their empire threatened on all sides, internal union was an absolute necessity for its successful defence. But the religious disputants cared little, apparently, for their country's welfare. Patriotism was forgotten in the ardor of controversy; and, to the lasting dishonor of Eastern ecclesiastics, they remained faithful to this unworthy tradition up to the moment when they ceased to exist as a state. Their proud disdain for their western brethren led them to prefer bondage under the Turk to freedom with subjection to the lawful head of the Church. They are still enjoying the consequences.

Thus it came about that the Eastern branch of the Church fell completely under the control of the civil power. The ancient laws of free election became a dead letter; the destinies of church and state were inseparable. Meanwhile the Church of Italy, under a series of noble Roman bishops, had begun the work of civilization which makes society its everlasting debtor. When the empire fell before the repeated attacks of the barbarians, the Church, because independent of it, not only survived, but undertook and successfully accomplished the task of converting the young and vigorous peoples who settled on the ruins of Roman power. But the popes would not willingly see perish so much that was good in Roman institutions. The barbarians, therefore, were taught not only the faith of Christ but also the full value of the "Written Reason" of the empire. So that no sooner were the warrior princes of the North baptized, than they were invested with the emblems of consul and patrician; and in time the empire itself was restored, and its ruler consecrated, as was David, to rule according to the law of God and of His Church.

But how was the Roman Church able to carry on, in the midst of what often seemed insurmountable difficulties, so great a work? Simply because she was free from the trammels of despotism. The papacy, by means of its great wealth and generosity, drew to its side the *people*. Hence the privilege

preserved to the lower clergy and people in the choice of their bishops. In the latter days of the Western Empire and thence throughout the period of the Lombard kingdom and the Byzantine exarchate, a close union was maintained between the Roman bishop and the Italian people. In consequence, the former could bid defiance to those who had the will but not the power to enslave their see. True, they suffered much now and then from the Lombard kings and the emperors of the exarchate period. But the danger from the former was transient; and if they bore from the latter, at times, more than they need have borne, it was because the ideal of a Christian empire was still dear to them. Despite the hatred and opposition they encountered in Eastern prelates, and more particularly in the patriarchs of Constantinople, the popes made many sacrifices to maintain a united Christendom. So that we see them at one and the same time propping up the effete Byzantine government and allowing themselves and the churches of Rome to be despoiled by the unscrupulous minions of the East.

But if tolerant of petty tyranny, in one sphere the successors of St. Peter were uncompromising. Sophistry, cunning, and brute force could not bring the bishops of Rome, backed by all the bishops of the West, to betray the faith. It may have been that Vigilius was ambitious of power, and, when deprived of it, weak. Byzantine venom bursting forth in the sixth ecumenical council might pour its vials on the memory of good-natured Honorius, whose only fault was that of his successor, Leo X, believing a grave question to be a trifle. Notwithstanding, Constantinople with its train of heretical bishops¹ could not point to any Roman bishop and say he was a heretic. By the light of the Vatican council we are able to see a higher reason for this phenomenon; but looking at the question solely from a historical standpoint, it is evident that the popes, from the fourth to the eighth century, were able to preserve the Christian faith pure and undefiled, because the best elements among the people were always on their side.

But what of Gaul during these same ages? From what we are told by Sidonius Appollinaris, we can judge that the people

¹ Hergenroether: Photius vol. I. cap. I.

there were of a different stamp, and that the lower clergy were too often unworthy of their office. This goes to show that if the Church must rely on the great body of her members, those members must be worthy of the name. The Roman Church herself, so long well-disposed towards lay influence, was at length compelled to exclude all but the Roman clergy, or cardinals, from the election of her bishops.

At best, then, the intimate connection of laics with ecclesiastical affairs is but a temporary expedient, good enough so long as a common interest demands it. But when the pressure of danger from an external source, such as threatened Italy from the fifth to the ninth century, has ceased, popular passion and worldly ambition are likely to combine against the Church's well being.

In Gaul, the clergy and laity disappear, or exercise a merely nominal influence, from the beginning of the Merovingian dynasty. The many abuses, the principal of which have been enumerated, existing in the Gallic Church prior to St. Boniface, were, as in the Eastern Empire, due chiefly to royal intermeddling in the choice of bishops. Bishops are everywhere in the Catholic Church local centers from which emanate good or bad influences, according as the occupant of the episcopal chair is animated or not for his Master's service. King-made prelates were rarely remarkable for ardor in any cause but that of their civil master, and under the Merovingians there were few exceptions to the rule. These few, however, strove manfully against the tide of corruption, but with little success, until the rock of Rome arose to bar the way.

The Church, from a very early date, was composed of several great divisions or patriarchates, Rome in the West, Alexandria in Africa, and Antioch in the far East. The bishops of these sees exercised jurisdiction over certain metropolitans and their suffragans. Only in matters of the gravest moment was the pope called on to interfere; and this is readily intelligible to one who considers the physical impossibility, in those days, of frequent recourse to Rome. For the same reason the popes constituted primates in Gaul, Spain, and England. The popes were too busily engaged with the Oriental christological controversies and with the Lombards to do more than

give general directions. In those days Rome's care of the Universal Church partook of the nature of a mother's care for her children. Her charity was world-famed, and only rarely did she exercise what is called *contentious jurisdiction*. When prosperity had made many cold as to the things of eternity, appeals to her judicial tribunal became more frequent ; but, of her own accord, she did not interfere with the local authorities unless in matters of vital interest to Christianity. But though the bishops of Rome always respected particular customs, on one subject they always insisted—the observance of the *canons*. Their exhortations to bishops may be summed up in the phrase : Enforce law ; and to the faithful : Obey your bishops.

The spirit of nationalism led the Orientals to disregard papal admonitions; the warlike tendencies of the Western nations hindered, for a time, their operation. The right moment for more direct supervision had to be awaited, and it came with St. Boniface. Thenceforward, the papal authority, when free, was exercised in checking or eliminating long-standing abuses, and thus prevented the Church from degenerating into a state institution, tolerated by kings as an instrument of despotism.

MAURICE F. HASSETT.

A DECADE OF PROGRESS IN NEUROLOGICAL WORK.

Within recent years the attention of biologists has been concentrated more than ever upon the constitution and functioning of the nervous system, and much work has been done by neurologists in an endeavor to acquire more reliable information on these subjects. Our understanding of its marvelous unity is far from comprehensive, though much has been done to dispel the darkness that once enshrouded it. The decade just closed has been especially noteworthy in this regard. It ushered in a new era in the study of neurology by introducing new methods of research.

To appreciate the magnitude and consequences of the change brought about during this period, requires at least an elementary knowledge of the origin and development of the cerebro-spinal system. In its ultimate analysis every living organism, whether plant or animal, may be reduced to a fundamental substance known as protoplasm.¹ No analytical method with which we are acquainted at present can furnish a detailed and exact knowledge of the chemical constituents of this substance, because any reagent that may be employed reduces it to the condition of dead matter. In appearance it is a translucent, granular mass composed of minute rounded bodies, to which the name cell has been given. In animals this protoplasmic cell is bounded by a membrane which, in plants, is replaced by a cellulose cell-wall. The cytoplasm, or cell-content, is traversed by fibrils, which radiate from the centrosome and form a delicate net-work attached to the surrounding wall. Near the centrosome is a modified portion of protoplasm, known as the nucleus and considered by many as a foreign element which has forced its way into the cell.

This cellular mass of living matter is regarded by biologists as the substratum of all vital manifestations. It is capable of performing definite functions either alone or as part of an or-

¹Wilson, "The Cell in Development and Inheritance," p. 13 f.

ganized whole. From this fundamental unit all forms of plant and animal life—from the protophyta to the giant oak, from the protozoa to man—have developed. The growth of the cell-content and its differentiation along certain lines have given rise to the almost innumerable species of living organisms which abound in the world around us.

The mode of reproduction of the cell is characteristic.¹ The centrosome divides into two parts. These gradually pass to opposite sides of the nuclear mass, which then separates into two portions, each of which migrates toward a pole of the cell. At this stage the cell body becomes constricted as if a string were drawn tightly round it; and, finally, instead of one large parent-cell two daughter-cells appear. In the lower forms of life these separate entirely and exist independently of each other; but in the higher and more complex organisms they adhere to each other, undergo various subdivisions in regular order, and in the course of time form an aggregation of cells without any definite arrangement or unity of function. This morular stage is of short duration. Owing to difference in growth, some of the cells take up a definite position with reference to the organized mass, forcing the others to arrange themselves in the form of a cup-shaped organism known as a gastrula. This stage of development is characterized by an outer and an inner layer of cells called, respectively, ectoderm and entoderm, the intervening space being occupied by the mesoderm. To modifications of these three primitive layers of cells may be traced the entire structure of man.

The entodermic tissue is characterized by its digestive and assimilative power, and to it may be traced, in part at least, the complex mechanism involved in the digestion and assimilation of the food supply taken into the system. The mesoderm furnishes the muscular, vascular and connective tissues.

The ectodermic or exterior layer of cells possesses in a marked degree the quality of irritability, or the power of responding to an external stimulus. In the process of differentiation which it undergoes, many of the cells lose their exceeding sensitiveness to certain modes of excitation, and form the exposed layer or epidermis of the skin with its appendages.

¹Parker, "Elementary Biology," p. 65 f.

Another group of ectodermic cells sinks into the mesodermic layer, and forms a groove on the dorsal side which develops into a cylindrical column extending the whole length of the body. This soon separates from the parent layer, which closes around it, and, after undergoing further modification, becomes the nervous substance enclosed within and protected by the bones of the head and of the spinal column. This nervous substance is divided into two chief portions—the brain and the spinal cord, which, with the network of ramifications to all parts of the body, constitute the cerebro-spinal system.

A cross section of the cord reveals the fact that it is not of uniform color, but is composed of white and grey matter; the former occupying the external part of the cord and the inner portion of the cerebral hemispheres, and the latter the central portion of the cord and the outer layers of the brain.

Of what is this nerve substance composed? Is it made up exclusively of the modified cells of the ectodermic layer, or do we find traces of any other constituents? If the latter be the case, what are the relations of the elements to each other and to the whole mass? Briefly stated, the nerve substance consists of nerves, nerve cells, and a species of connective tissue known as neuroglia, occupying the interstices between the cells and fibres and binding them into a single whole. To the eye a nerve presents the appearance of a whitish or greyish cord of uniform texture, but viewed through a microscope its structure is seen to be highly diversified. In reality it is made up of several bundles of nerve fibres, bound together by connective tissue. If we trace it to the periphery, we find that it terminates in a single strand of nerve matter, called a nerve fibre. These fibres are most abundant in the white portion of the cord and constitute the ascending and descending paths of nerve currents.

Nerve cells vary in shape and size, and are located chiefly in the grey portion of the brain and cord. They are generally represented as small irregular masses of granular cytoplasm containing a nucleus and giving off one or more processes or branches. These processes are of two kinds—protoplasmic and axis-cylinder. The former, called also dendrons, are continuous with the cell substance itself, and may be regarded as pro-

longations of it which penetrate into the surrounding medium, each giving off branches in its course, somewhat as a tree does, until finally it occupies quite an extended area. The axis-cylinders or neurons of nerve cells are very different from those just described. They are modified extensions of the cellular substance. When treated with chemicals which stain them, they present the appearance of fine dark lines, running generally to a considerable distance from the cell and sending off at right angles small fibres of similar appearance, called collaterals. These processes seem to be quite simple in structure; but if a cross section be subjected to close examination three concentric layers are distinctly visible—a central or axis-cylinder proper, consisting of a compact bundle of fibrils; a thick fatty covering known as the medullary sheath; and a protective layer or envelope called the neurilemma. It is by means of these neurons and their collaterals that the peripheral organs of the body are brought into direct communication with the central nervous system.

The purpose and manner of functioning of the nerve cells and fibres have been fruitful subjects for discussion among neurologists for the past half century; but it is only within the last decade that patient and detailed investigation has added to our knowledge sufficiently to enable us to draw any definite conclusions with reference to their connection and interaction. This does not surprise us, however, when we remember the peculiar difficulties which, until recent years, attended any attempt to obtain more than probable results. The nervous system, more than any other part of the human organism, presents peculiarities of structure the unraveling of which baffled for years the skill of cytologists. It is comparatively easy by means of certain stains to segregate the cell from the surrounding tissue in other parts of the body, to trace its definite outline and examine its external configuration. But the nerve cell, as we have seen, is not a compact body of unbroken border, but rather, if I may so express it, a fusing of processes the terminal branches of which lie hidden from view in the nervous substance itself. Some years ago, it is true, Nissel¹ obtained, by means of differential stains, a good knowledge of the inter-

¹ Barker. "Anatomy and Physiology of the Nervous System and its Constituent Neurons."—*New York Medical Journal*, September 18, 1897.

nal structure and contents of a cell ; but before the year 1890 no method of treatment was known by means of which the nerve cell and its prolongations could be shown in their true position with reference to adjacent cells and fibres.

Those who had devoted any time to an examination of the elements of the nervous system were not without some knowledge of their method of functioning, and were able to recognize in their distribution and supposed connection a purposeful adaptation of means to end. By an experiment easily repeated, they proved that the physiological function of a nerve is the conduction of impulses either to or from the central system, thus keeping the brain informed of the changes wrought in every part of the organism under its control ; and that the nerve cell, in addition to conductivity, possesses the power of generating new impulses and of reinforcing those brought into contact with it by the nerve fibers.

We know that if a peripheral end-organ of sense responds to an external stimulus, a nerve current passes along an afferent fibre to a cell in the posterior horn of the spinal cord, is transmitted to a cell in the anterior horn, whence, by an efferent path, the proper response is sent to a motor end-organ. Let us suppose, for instance, that a person accidentally places his finger on a hot surface. Immediately an impulse is transmitted to the brain which, acting on the information received, sends back a message commanding the withdrawal of the finger. All this takes place in a moment, and we seldom stop to analyze the mechanism involved. The impulse passes through several cells and along numerous fibres. This naturally presupposes some kind of a connection between fibre and fibre, cell and cell, or between a nerve and a cell other than that in which it originates. What is the nature of this connection ? Is the bond of union such as to form an uninterrupted line of communication between cell and cell, analogous to that which the Atlantic cable furnishes between the Old World and the New ? If we deny anatomical continuity between the elements which function in the transmission of impulses, how account for the observed phenomena ? The attention which this problem received from neurologists shows that it was considered a question of vital importance, on the solution of which de-

pended a fuller understanding of much that was unexplained in the harmonious working of the nervous system.

Besides Nissel, whose contribution to the science has been already referred to, there were many who, during the past half century, endeavored to solve the much-debated question of the correlation of cells and fibres in the nervous system.

The hematoxyline preparation of Weigert¹ which colored the sheaths of the medullated nerve processes, rendered possible a partial determination of the course of single bundles of fibres in the cord and brain.

Flechsig² introduced the embryological method of tracing the course of the conduction paths in the white matter. It was based on the fact that the neurons of different groups of cells in the central system acquired medullated sheaths at different periods of their embryonic development.

Deiters employed a method of tissue staining which had been proposed by Gerlach, and described the two kinds of nerve cell processes. In France, Bouchard, Charcot and others made use of different methods to locate the path of nerve currents in the spinal cord.

This work, though incomplete, was not valueless. It prepared the way and made easy the task for future investigators. To a certain extent, it limited the field of operation and turned the current of thought into a definite channel. From their investigations the older generation of neurologists concluded that the nerve cell processes united, or, as it is generally expressed, anastomosed with each other, and gave to the nervous system anatomical continuity. When we consider the vast number of cells involved and the network of fibres which penetrate every part, crossing each other and recrossing in weblike complexity, we do not marvel at their deduction, which we now know to be unwarranted and erroneous. It is true, they did not demonstrate the anatomical unity which they advocated, but it was the best hypothesis they could frame to explain the observed physiological reactions.

Doubtless they foresaw that this problem would not be satisfactorily and definitely solved, until a method of treating nerve tissue would be discovered which would give more prom-

¹ Lenhossék, "Der Feinere Bau des Nervensystems im Lichte Neuerer Forschungen."

² Cajal, "Les Nouvelles Idées sur la Structure du Système Nerveux."

inence to some fibres than to others, and thus enable us to outline their course and observe their endings. Here was an opportunity not to be neglected. The fortunate discoverer would be a benefactor of the race and reap undying fame in his chosen field of labor. Naturally all eyes turned for a solution of the question to that country whose sons have for many years been in the van of the great army of technical experts, leaving to others the work of generalization, while they busy themselves in amassing the minute details which form the groundwork of every science. In this case, however, the palm of victory was snatched from the German universities and their bands of trained workers. To Italy and Spain belongs the honor of this greatest neurological discovery of modern times. It is inseparably linked with the names of Camillo Golgi of Pavia and Ramon y Cajal of Madrid. The former discovered the method, the latter improved it, and by a series of delicate experiments demonstrated its scientific value. Golgi's process was tentative; it afforded an indication of the manner in which the problem might be solved. It drew aside for an instant the veil which hid from view the mysterious functioning of the nervous system, and intensified the desire for fuller knowledge. The Spanish histologist began experimenting with Golgi's method, improved and elaborated the process, and at last succeeded in obtaining highly satisfactory results. The manner of staining nerve tissue which he proposed, settled forever the discussion regarding the unity underlying the operations of the central nervous system.

Golgi¹ employed two methods named, from the chief chemicals used, the silver chromate process and the mercuric bichloride process. The former, in general use before the time of Cajal, consisted in hardening pieces of the nerve tissue in a solution of bichromate of potassium and then subjecting it to the action of silver nitrate, which deposited a reddish-black precipitate of silver chromate in some of the nerve cells. In the second method the silver salt was replaced by bichloride of mercury, and the resulting greyish-black precipitate showed the position and arrangement of certain cells and fibres. The latter process is generally made use of to verify the results obtained from the salts of silver.

¹ Cajal, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

By the use of these methods fairly good results were obtained by Golgi himself. He was enabled to demonstrate the truth of two fundamental conceptions, namely, the presence of axis-cylinder processes originating in the nerve cells and giving off collateral branches; and the free termination of the dendrons in the nerve substance without the formation of a complex network. He admitted, however, an anastomosis of the terminal branches of collaterals emanating from different neurons. These results would have been fairly satisfactory were it not for the fact that the stain did not bring the elements into sufficient prominence to permit of their being traced with an accuracy that would lead to any definite conclusion as to their position with reference to each other. By remedying its defects Cajal gained both time and distinctness of outline. To the solution of potassic bichromate in distilled water he added some osmic acid and immersed a certain amount of nerve tissue in a definite quantity of it. After the lapse of several days, he removed the tissue from this bath, washed it in distilled water and plunged it into a solution of silver nitrate, to which, in some cases, he added a few drops of formic acid for every 300 grams of the liquid. At the end of about thirty-six hours, he removed the specimen, dried and mounted it and obtained a distinctness of outline which the lapse of several years failed to dim.

Such, in brief, is the Cajal rapid process of tissue impregnation—a process extensively employed by neurologists in our own time. It ushered in a new era in the study of the constituents of the nervous system and rendered possible an exact knowledge of their physiological functioning. By the use of this method histologists are enabled to secure a well-defined cell body and to trace with accuracy every expansion of it, because the stain shows even the minutest branches with a distinctness never before approached. At first the announcement of Cajal's success was received with incredulity by his fellow-workers, but when their own experiments proved the truth of his claims they did not withhold the praise so justly due him.

The immediate result of this discovery was an increased activity among neurologists, who were anxious to test the new

method. It was taken up with eagerness in Germany, France, Italy, Spain and elsewhere. In every case the results confirmed those obtained by Cajal himself. An impetus was thus given to the study of the nerve tissue, and much valuable information on this subject has since been embodied in monographs by such authorities as Van Gehuchten, Koelliker, Retzius and Lenhossék.

Though Cajal's fame rests chiefly upon this discovery, it is by no means the only claim he has to a place in the foremost rank of men of science. The hypothesis of nerve continuity was still a hypothesis. No proof had been adduced either for or against it. This traditional belief of his predecessors, embodied in the idea of anatomical continuity, received its death-blow from his discovery that the nerve processes of one cell do not anastomose with those of another, each cell and its expansions constituting an individual unit in close relation, it is true, with numerous other cells, but never fusing with any of them. He demonstrated beyond the possibility of a doubt that the neurons and their collaterals end in arborizations in the immediate vicinity of cells or among the many dendritic branches which terminate freely in the nervous matter. The impulses generated or reinforced in any cell pass out from it by way of the axis-cylinder process, spread to the terminal arborizations, thence to the dendritic endings in the vicinity, and by the latter are borne to the cells of which they are the prolongations. This view limits the function of nerve fibres to conduction in one direction—the neurons being cellulifugal and the dendrons cellulipetal paths. In this way the transmission of impulses from one cell to another takes place, not by continuity of nerve fibres, but by their contiguity or juxtaposition. The demonstration of this truth completely disproved the assertion made by Golgi some years before, that the sole function of the protoplasmic prolongations was to supply nutrition to the cell, in much the same way as the roots of a tree extract from the surrounding soil the food necessary for its growth and development. Golgi also maintained that they were connected with the neuroglia, but there does not seem to be any evidence in support of such a view. Moreover, wherever dendrons terminate there are also found the endings

of axis-cylinder processes. Each cell with its connections is capable of performing a certain portion of the work allotted to the nervous system, and in no circumstances can it be made to overstep this limit.

This fact of cell individuality is but one of many important truths with which Cajal has enriched the science. While pursuing his researches into the structure and working of the nervous system, he was confronted by another characteristic of the cellular units to which reference has already been made. Previously to this time, it was believed that nerve currents could pass over the same fibre either to or from the cell body. If this were so, there would be plenty of room for speculation as to the result of a meeting of opposing impulses in the same fibre. When Cajal established the fact that every fibre was either a cellulifugal or a cellulipetal conductor, it was not difficult for him to draw the obvious conclusion that nerve currents always pass through the cell in the same direction. This polarity of nerve currents, as it is termed, is vouched for by what has been found to occur in the higher animals and in man. It is demonstrated most easily by an examination of the structure of an end-organ of sense, especially of that of smell.

Every end-organ is endowed with selective power. It can be acted upon by a certain class of stimuli, and can transmit this action, after transforming it, to the central organ. The chief parts to be considered in an examination of the end-organ of smell, are the mucous membrane and the olfactory bulb.¹ The mechanism involved in the detection of an odor comes into contact with the external world in the upper region of the nasal cavities. Here is situated the mucous membrane, in which are imbedded the end-organs, by means of which we become conscious of the presence of an odor. It is composed of layers of epithelial cells, the chief rôle of which seems to be the providing of a support for the olfactory nerve cells and the preventing of any contact between the impulses they conduct. The olfactory corpuscles are long, irregular cells, giving off at each end a process, the larger and thicker of which passes to the outer surface of the mucous membrane, while the other, as

¹Cajal, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

a fine nerve fibre, penetrates to the olfactory bulb. This connection, long suspected, was not conclusively proved to exist until the discovery of the special staining process of Golgi and Cajal. The olfactory bulb is generally regarded as a diminutive cerebral lobe, comprising numerous fibres and cells, which are brought into requisition whenever an impulse passes from the end-organ of smell to the brain. The neurons of the olfactory cells which penetrate into this bulb, end in arborizations within small ovoidal bodies known as glomeruli. Here also terminate the dendrons of triangular-shaped or mitral cells situated in a remote zone of the olfactory bulb. These mitral cells have neurons which constitute the olfactory tract leading to the brain.

If we bear in mind these few anatomical details, it will not be a difficult task to outline the path of nerve impulses and trace their course from the exterior of the nasal lining to the brain. The odor emitted by any substance is wafted by a current of air into the nasal passages, and there comes into contact with the mucous membrane and acts as a stimulus for the end-organs distributed over its surface. It is transformed in some way into a nerve current which passes along the dendron of a bipolar olfactory cell, traverses the cell body itself, and by way of the axis-cylinder process is conducted to the olfactory bulb. Here it divides up among the terminal branches, which, as we have already learned, end in a glomerulus among the dendritic ramifications of a mitral cell. Golgi had followed its course thus far, but he believed that its proximity to the protoplasmic arborizations had no physiological value. He maintained that the impulses were conveyed from the neurons of the olfactory cells by centripetal fibres having their origin in the glomeruli before mentioned.

Cajal showed that no centripetal fibres escape from these bodies, and that if the impulse continues its course, as it certainly does, it can only do so by passing to the dendritic branchings of the mitral cells. Once the current reaches a mitral cell, there is only one path open to it—that which conducts it by way of an axis-cylinder process into the region of the bulb, which contains the bundles of fibres leading to the

brain. It passes over this path and is received by the pyramidal cells of the cerebral cortex, and is thus brought to the brain itself, which presides over the functioning of the cerebro-spinal system.

From this brief analysis, it is evident that the impulse which traverses the distance between the end-organ and the brain is afferent, and that no efferent impulse is sent back over the same path. In this centripetal journey the current passes through many cells, all of which it enters by the protoplasmic, and leaves by the axis-cylinder, process. This is the only course open to it, and the disposition of the dendrons and neurons shows that the rôle of the former is to conduct impulses towards the cell body, while that of the latter is to admit of their passage away from it. This orderly arrangement is never violated in the nervous system. There is here, as in every other part of the realm of animate nature, a division of labor—a setting aside of definite functions for a definite organ or group of organs. The more perfect the organization, the higher the specialization of functions and the more complex the harmonious action of the whole. The relation between cells and fibres in the nervous system furnishes us an example of this, and led Cajal to undertake an investigation that resulted in his discovery of the polarity of nerve currents. His deductions have been verified by a host of workers, among whom Koelliker, Van Gehuchten, Retzius and Lenhossék are deserving of special mention.

But they have done more than confirm his observations. They have penetrated into the new land pointed out by him, and have returned laden with its long-concealed treasures. The work of exploration has not yet ceased. Each year opens up new avenues of research and increases the fund of knowledge we hold in trust for posterity.

JAMES M. REARDON.

*Academy of Psychology,
St. Paul Seminary.*

THE PLACE OF HEBREW IN THE PROGRAMS OF OUR SEMINARIES.

Everybody knows it is very small ; some understand and say it ought to be larger ; how much larger it ought to be very few realize ; fewer, perhaps, are aware that to give Hebrew its proper place in our programs, entails a recast of those programs, not simply an addition, however large and apparently important that addition may be.

I intend in this paper to emphasize the fact that the study of Hebrew has become just as essential a feature of our preparatory courses as Latin and Greek, and that it is our duty to introduce it and insist upon it strictly, even at the cost of a complete recast of our programs. I will then explain why the study of Hebrew has been so far neglected in our seminaries, hoping that such an explanation may check in the mind of my readers every tendency to base on that neglect an argument against the opportuneness of giving Hebrew a larger place in the programs than it has heretofore occupied. I am afraid I shall not be completely successful in my attempt. It is said that in difficult undertakings one must aim higher than the mark. This I cannot do, for in my opinion, the importance of the study of Hebrew for our young clerics cannot be over-rated ; nay, I have a presentiment that what I consider now high enough will prove to be below the mark before the next century is over. Yet I will be satisfied if I succeed in persuading the leaders and educators I have in view to take the first steps in the right direction. Time, with God's help, will do the rest.

I. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY OF HEBREW.

To forestall any misunderstanding I shall at once admit that the study of Hebrew in theology is entirely secondary ; hence, I have already said that it is entitled to a prominent place in a course *preparatory* to theology. I may even go

safely farther in the way of concessions and say that Hebrew is not exactly necessary for a course preparatory to *scholastic* theology, such as that system was perfected by St. Thomas Aquinas and many other eminent theologians of the middle ages, none of whom knew a word of Hebrew. The position I take and hope to hold is that, by the side of the scholastic theology, two important factors have now entered the field of the theological sciences: philology and historical criticism. For the past three hundred years religious thought has been undergoing a process of evolution, which has brought us to the very antipodes of the thirteenth century. The demand was then especially for speculative studies, now it is chiefly for positive science, both in Scripture and tradition. The following pages will show what an important part the study of Hebrew played, and yet plays, in that evolution of biblical lore, and consequently justifies the prominent place I claim for it in our program of theological studies.

The beginnings of Hebrew scholarship date from the thirteenth century. Naturally enough they were modest and slow. The first to advocate that study were actuated by apostolic zeal; they dreamed of converting the Jews to Christianity. Such men found encouragement with the popes, who repeatedly issued decrees to enforce the establishment of chairs of Hebrew in the most important universities. Practically those chairs were a failure.* Their occupants were necessarily converted Jews, and the Christian public was not always convinced of their sincerity. Besides, there prevailed in many minds an intense hatred, or, at least, a contempt for the Jews, coupled with the most complete mistrust of their teaching. The Christian disliked to appeal to them for any assistance, and it took fully four centuries to conquer that prejudice even among the most enlightened people.

Towards the close of the fifteenth century, the renaissance gave a fresh and more effective impulse to the study of Hebrew. Along with the classical revival, Oriental studies now assumed considerable proportions. Hebrew first attracted the attention of scholars. No longer content to speak of it with respect, they applied themselves to a thorough study of it. It

* For another account of that failure see below under II.

was not enough to know Latin and Greek—a perfect humanist was obliged to be conversant in the primitive language from which all the others were supposed to be derived. However, this scientific interest in Hebrew was from the beginning sometimes furthered, sometimes hindered by religious considerations, not always based on truly scientific principles. Still it had important results; the diffusion among scholars of the study of Hebrew, and above all the publication of the grammar and dictionary of Reuchlin. Through these works, Christians became independent of the suspected Jews, converted or not, without whom, so far, no Christian (not excepting St. Jerome) had been able to enter the mysterious precincts of Jewish literature.

With the Reformation begins a new phase in the history of the academic recognition of Hebrew. Born of apostolic zeal, it had been fostered during its infancy by humanism, under the protection of the papacy. It enters now the field of theology as a necessary consequence of the supremacy claimed for the Scripture by the reformers. It is strange, however, to see how it is welcomed by Catholics and Protestants; by the former with excessive diffidence, by the latter with too much confidence, though not without some apprehension. It is evident that the true importance of that study is not yet understood; no one suspects the part it is going to play in the evolution of theological science. The men who, some day, will know how to use it, are not born yet.

The arguments in favor of the excellence of the sacred language, are alike for both parties, and equally childish. Forster, who assisted Luther in his translation of the Bible (Luther was ignorant of both Greek and Hebrew) says that Hebrew deserves special attention because it is both a holy and a useful language, holy because it is the first and oldest language, the one used by the Holy Trinity in creating the world, and in revealing itself; holy, also, because in it the Son of God redeemed us; in it Adam named the animals, the birds and the fishes, which means clearly that it is the fittest language to express the nature of things. Until the building of the Tower of Babel there was, he maintained, no other language; the diversity and confusion of languages then followed by way of

punishment, to the incredible damage of the Church, although God preserved the sacred language in the holy family of Heber, in order that He might make to Abraham the promises relating to his blessed seed, our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a useful language, because it helps us to defend the Scripture against the rabbis who corrupted and adulterated it; it enables us to understand the inner meaning of Scriptural words, and uphold their true sense against the mockeries of the Jews, etc. On the other side, Wicel, a bitter opponent of Luther, says we can not study Hebrew with too much zeal, because it traces its origin back to Moses. God, Christ, and the Apostles spoke it. It is much more important than the classical languages; it possesses many varied advantages in our conflict with the infidels; it is useful even in prayer, for it sounds so sweet and religious that merely to read it fills one with piety and the strongest faith. Such were the views of both Catholics and Protestants, taken as a body, up to the first decades of the seventeenth century. One sees clearly that the old prejudice against the treacherous Jews has not disappeared from their minds. Not once,¹ that I know of, did they use the study of Hebrew against each other during that period, if we except a few occasional skirmishes on the relative importance of the Hebrew text and the old versions; the Protestants saying that the Vulgate and the Septuagint were the work of the devil, the Septuagint especially, because the seventy-two interpreters were Jews who skillfully deceived the candid Ptolemy; whilst the Catholics were inclined to cherish suspicion of a text which had been for centuries in the exclusive possession of the born enemies of Christianity, and to rely implicitly on the two versions, both made in old times, and ever since adopted by the Fathers of the Church. This shows clearly that nobody then had the slightest idea of Criticism, in the eyes of which Hebrew, Latin, and Greek are of equal importance for the establishment of the correct reading.

Nevertheless, on both sides there were active and judicious scholars who had the courage to set aside all religious prejudices and take up again the question of Scripture on an entirely new, thoroughly scientific basis. Their patient labors

¹ See, however, Hottinger, *Analecta*.

gradually revealed some facts, each of which might have led to the discovery of textual criticism. It was, for instance, demonstrated that the present so-called square letters are not the original characters of the Hebrew writings, and that many errors not only could have occurred but in fact did occur in the transliteration from the old to the new characters; further, that the vowel-points, far from being of Mosaico-divine origin, had been invented at as late a date as the sixth century of our era; finally, that the consonants, till then regarded as having been miraculously preserved from corruption, had suffered considerable alteration at the hands of careless copyists and unintelligent correctors. These three facts (not to burden the mind of the reader with others) were enough in the hands of a Morin or a Cappel to create textual criticism of the Bible. Nor did the prestige of Hebrew studies suffer, as the uninitiated might believe, from the discovery that the so-called original text of the Scriptures was not so reliable as everybody formerly believed. It was, on the contrary, considerably increased. That text, hence to be known as the Masoretic Text, had proved to be nothing more than another witness, younger, it is true, than either the Septuagint or the Vulgate, but all-important because behind it there lay, discoverable if not visible, the true Hebrew text, the original of the sacred writings. Hebrew epigraphy and palaeography by the same fact had asserted their rights. Henceforth something more than a mere elementary knowledge of the language was required.

Another step in the evolution of biblical studies enhanced the importance of the study of Hebrew. In the wake of lower criticism followed the higher criticism. From the text the attention of independent scholars was naturally turned to the question of the genuinity of the Bible. What had been in the past the literary vicissitudes of that Great Book, covering a period of ten or twelve centuries of religious and political life in a small nation divided into two rival kingdoms, in a small country, the battlefield of such gigantic empires as Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, constantly overrun by the armies of the Babylonians, Assyrians, Hittites, Egyptians, Chaldeans, and Macedonians, whose population was repeatedly scattered to all points of the compass? What could have been the desti-

nies of that book, or rather of the different books of which that book was made? Despite the strongest faith in a watchful Providence, was it not clear that such a book must have had a history more stormy, more agitated than any other book? And does not that supposition become a certainty when we read the Scriptures themselves; the finding of the law under Josiah, the words of Esdras, and so on. Spinoza bent his mind upon this all-important problem, not so much as a member of the Jewish community, from which he had been cut off, but as a philosopher. Richard Simon did it as a scientist, as a critical, judicious historian, unflinching and serene in his work, never shaken from his undertaking by the attacks of the scandalized pusillanimous Catholic or Protestant; conscious that he was answering a demand from the general Catholic public, a demand that would naturally be met, if he did not step forward, by some one else probably less enlightened and less sincerely convinced of the right of his position as a Catholic. What Spinoza had simply outlined Simon carried out in a new, original, and we may well say, definite way, so far at least as the general principles were concerned.

I beg the reader not to mistake these words for an endorsement of all the views of Richard Simon, especially not of the positive portion of his system. He might have been wrong in his views from the beginning to the end; that matters little. The fact remains that with him originated the higher criticism of the Bible, which, however thoroughly opposed, spread with a rapidity that shows that it really responded to a need felt by all classes of educated people.

To be brief, I shall only state the stubborn fact that the existence of higher criticism renders the study of Hebrew, on the part of our Catholic theological scholars, still more necessary than lower criticism ever did. How is it possible without it to take an active part in the historical investigation of the Bible, or even understand enough of modern research in this line to satisfy the ever-growing curiosity of the educated Catholic layman? Now that the results of higher criticism are scattered broadcast in the periodicals, nay in the daily press, is it not one of the strictest duties of our clergy to acquaint themselves with Hebrew? Must we not, as St. Paul did, make

ourselves all to all? Can we do this unless we not only know Hebrew well enough to read it, but also learn the history and growth of the language? Indeed that study will take us much farther than a simple reading knowledge of the Hebrew. It will require in the end a fairly good knowledge of the cognate languages, like the Assyrian, Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic, of the necessity of which I shall speak later. In fact the biblical scholar ought to know Hebrew better than the average priest knows Latin and Greek, at least he ought to know it more scientifically.

Such being the importance *in se* of these studies, let us see how they fare in our theological institutions. Every seminary professor must regret that the course in Hebrew is limited, on the average, to one year. During that year, moreover, the student has to devote the greater part of his time to other branches, either philosophical or theological, and the professor himself is, in most cases, obliged to conduct several courses in addition to his class of Hebrew, which, as a consequence, comes to be regarded as a sort of necessary evil. It is not surprising, under these circumstances, that only a small number of seminary students should get a relish for the study of Hebrew, and that a much smaller number should rise to the position of specialists. And these few, we may candidly say, are self-made men, who owe more to their energy than to their opportunities. Men of genius they may be, but even the genius is not prepared to meet single-handed an organized and well-trained army.

A glance at the catalogues of German, English and American Universities, will show how different the situation is for non-Catholic students, and how thoroughly the tactics of the early reformers have been changed by their modern successors. If further evidence is needed, it is supplied in abundance by the ever-growing literature and the mass of publications that are the result of studies in Hebrew, and that bring constantly before the eyes of the learned world the names of scholars like Harper of Chicago, Moore of Andover, Toy of Harvard, Jastrow of Philadelphia, Haupt of Baltimore, McCurdy of Toronto, Cheyne and Driver of England, Wellhausen, Kautsch, Siegfried, Stade, Budde, Cornill, Kittell and Delitzsch of Germany.

Such men, we must remember, are known not only for their thorough training in their respective branches and their scholarly productions, but also for their scientific conscientiousness. To their work, indeed, our Catholic professors of Scripture are deeply indebted. They cannot be ignored like a Voltaire, a Semler, a Baur, or a Strauss, on the plea that they are prejudiced, argue *a priori*, or start from false premises. They are not our adversaries, but rather earnest seekers after the truth that should be as precious to us as it is to them. And if their own theories are not always such that we can accept them, they in turn must occasionally smile at the efforts of our scholars to refute theories that have long since passed into the archaeological museum of biblical studies. Finally, it must be observed that these men are not confined to a sphere of scholarship so high and remote that it keeps them out of touch with people of average education. The names cited above appear on the list of translators of the Polychrome edition of the Bible recently published under the auspices of the Johns Hopkins University. "Though based," as the preface says, "upon the combined biblical scholarship of the world, this is not a book for scholars only, but *for the people*." Hitherto one could cling to the Douai version, and the average man would offer in rebuttal the Revised version. One could justly answer that, after all, the latter represents only the Masoretic Text, a later witness than the Vulgate, of which the Douai version is a faithful rendering. Not so now; any owner of the Bible will come out with an array of critical arguments that bewilder the reader who is not familiar with the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the means of emendation that have been used by its editors. The Septuagint and the Vulgate versions are quoted at every step, either for approval or for rejection, in a way perfectly clear and intelligible, "so that he who runs may read." The heavy commentaries and glossaries, written in such foreign languages as French, German and Dutch, in which one justly saw a wall of protection, avail no longer. The wall has fallen and the enemy that hitherto could creep in only here and there through occasional English translations, enters now by the wide open gates of the fortress. Instead of imported versions, there is now offered to the American public an English translation by an American scholar.

From what I have said in the preceding pages, every fair reader will conclude that we ought to know Hebrew well, very well, both philologically and historically, in order to answer the present demands of the public for information as to the lower, or philological, and the higher, or literary, criticism of the Bible. Hebrew is now just as necessary as Latin and Greek, nay, far more necessary as far as philological and literary knowledge goes, for most of the Latin and Greek works the theologians have to read have been long since critically edited, so that an ordinary reading knowledge of those two languages is sufficient to the average theological student; not so for the original text of the Sacred Writings.

II. REASON OF THE INSIGNIFICANT PLACE OF THE STUDY OF HEBREW IN OUR SEMINARIES.

When the renaissance gave to the study of Hebrew the impulse of which we now see and enjoy the results, the universities had once for all assigned to that study a place in their programs. Naturally enough that place was of the second, not to say of the third or fourth order, because the study of Hebrew as then viewed, was not in harmony with the purpose of those institutions, much less with the plan on which they had raised the wonderful edifice of scholastic theology. When the eloquent and indefatigable advocate of the Oriental languages, Raymond Lully, appealed in their favor to the University of Paris, King Phillip the Fair, and the Council of Vienna, he had nothing in view but the conversion of the infidels. The papal decrees enforcing the teaching of Hebrew and other Oriental languages in the four universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna and Salamanca, do not make the slightest allusion to theology, but simply to the training of missionaries to enable them to carry on more effectively their work of evangelization.

In establishing the chairs the universities showed their obedience to the decrees of the popes and the councils; but the remuneration they gave the so-called converted Jews appointed to those chairs, showed clearly how reluctantly they obeyed. This is why all the efforts of the pioneer advocates of the cause of Hebrew studies had failed completely to arouse

the enthusiasm of the universities, which were of a purely speculative character. The humanists were not more capable of making an impression on the theologians; in fact their tendency was absolutely opposed to that of the universities; and it would have been a sufficient reason for those institutions to wage war against the study of Hebrew, if they had cared enough about it; but they were too indifferent for that. This attitude of the universities explains how for nearly a century the study of Hebrew developed by individual efforts on the part of men who formed the republic of letters, until Francis I, by the establishment of his trilingual college, gave them an organization. It is but fair to say that the humanists, in France at least, never attempted to force the ideas of the Sorbonne. They seem to have understood that the studies they were following had to develop and strengthen before they could pretend to the right of citizenship in the then only officially recognized republic of science. That out-door life had its hardships; it had also its advantages, those of independence, which the humanists seemed to feel above everything. When Francis I. established his college, which was to develop into the unique and far-famed Collège de France, Erasmus, the greatest of the humanists, could not be induced to take charge of it. This, in my opinion, is the best explanation that can be offered of the two parallel but entirely different courses followed by theology on the one side, and philology and historical science on the other, up to our time; and in this fact we have the explanation of the small place allotted to biblical and historical sciences in our programs, and consequently to philology and other sciences of an elementary character. It is to institutions entirely independent of the universities of France that we have to look for those men who fostered the growth of Oriental studies, to the Benedictines, the Oratorians, the Academy of Inscriptions and Belle-Lettres, the Collège de France, and, more recently, the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, and the like. The study of Hebrew was carried on vigorously in France, but not its teaching, or at least not its official teaching, to such as were trained for any special profession. Bossuet did not know Hebrew, and yet when he was born (1627), Reuchlin had been dead for 105 years.

The university, moreover, we must say it frankly, was on

the decline. Unable to keep up the high standard it had formerly established in speculative philosophy and theology, it was also incapable of understanding the new methods of positive theology that were then in demand. Its routine work became weaker and weaker in character, the consequence being that the great religious revolution found the clergy entirely unprepared, just as, two centuries later, the civil revolution found the monarchy unable to understand its principles. Still the university kept the upper hand in all decisions, thanks to its servile attachment to the government. Incapable of furthering studies, it kept them down, by a spirit of political rather than religious conservatism. Henry Margival is not far from the truth when he suggests that one of the chief reasons of the opposition of Bossuet to the publication of the *Histoire Critique*, was the unconditioned, perhaps unconscious, attachment of the great orator to the government. Anyhow it remains a fact that neither the distinguished prelate nor his friend and supporter, Nicole of Port Royal, seems to have realized the value of that work. Untrained in such lore they took for dogma what was mere theological opinion, just as they opposed truths that were to be defined as dogmas of the Church. Still the influence of Bossuet was powerful and far-reaching, as we might expect from such a genius; not, however, for the advancement of religious science.

When, under the impulse of the Council of Trent, seminaries were created, nothing definite was prescribed by that Council concerning the course of studies. That was left to the bishops, of whom, in France, the Sorbonne was the principal nursery. The same programs used by the university were adopted.

Besides, the main object of the seminaries was not so much the teaching of theology and of the different branches of study leading to it, as sacerdotal education, which, since the practical disappearance of the cathedral schools, had suffered so much from the lack of proper discipline. The bishops, where they could not find a competent staff of teachers, were left free to send the seminarians to the university; such was the case with the Seminary of St. Sulpice, whose inmates attended the courses of the Sorbonne until the suppression of that body by the revolution.

No reform took place in the programs of the seminaries after the revolution, the only change being that the instruction was uniformly given in the seminary itself by men who had received no special training for their work. This arrangement was undoubtedly a *pis-aller*, the best that could be made under the circumstances. The ranks of the clergy had been considerably thinned out by long political disturbances; the new seminaries had therefore to train priests, and above all to train missionaries, and in that they succeeded fully. As for theologians, it was counted a great deal if they could be as well equipped as before the revolution. So that up to our own times the seminaries continue the policy of the University of Paris, running on a line parallel to and never meeting the line pursued by the philological and historical sciences. A few educators understand that it ought not to be so; we owe them several laudable efforts to bring those two lines in contact; but always by way of additions to the old traditional programs in the theological seminaries, while nothing will be really effective without a complete recast of our programs, not only in the theological seminaries, but also and especially in the preparatory seminaries, where the root of the evil lies.

This question, however, deserves to be treated more exhaustively than can now be done. It will be the subject of another study.

HENRY HYVERNAT.

THE COLLEGE TRAINING OF THE CLERGY.¹

We are here to mark an epoch in a holy work. We come to rejoice at the well-earned success of Alma Mater, and to attest our appreciation of the labors which, for fifty years, have been so fruitful in the field of ecclesiastical education. Not as members of any one class are we gathered, nor as companions of one college period, nor yet as men to whom life has brought, since our college days ended, an identical experience. Whatever have been the vicissitudes of our maturer years, in the various seminaries of the world, in the many dioceses of our country, in different spheres of priestly activity, beneath unequal burdens of toil or of honor, a common bond unites us to-day; we are alumni of St. Charles' College.

Of those who were the founders and early builders of this institution, nearly all have laid down their tasks forever. Of the thousands who are named on the rolls of the college, too many have learned the last lesson. But the college itself, still young, outlives individual lives. It takes vigor from time, though time prey on master and pupil. It preserves in its growing strength the efforts of the men whom it survives. It brings to reality their fairest ideals and makes part of its lasting heritage the good things for which they hoped. To this over-life of the college, so rich in attainment, not to the success of any one man, we pay tribute. Achievement without the suggestion of limit calls for congratulation with no undertone of regret. Advance, through difficulties perhaps but unchecked by decline, warrants our confidence in the future. A jubilee we certainly keep; but its keynote is the promise of greater activity, not the invitation nor the welcome to repose.

What that activity is and what it shall be, we can best understand by noting the influences which fashion the growth of the college. And such understanding, I venture to say, is specially needful to us, who, for the most part, are absorbed in the work of the ministry. We are apt, without breach of loy-

¹ An address delivered before the faculty and alumni of St. Charles' College, at the celebration of its fiftieth anniversary, June 16, 1898.

alty or lack of interest, to think of St. Charles' as a goodly place, where life runs on in the round of the seasons—a pleasant abode where change is unknown and the spirit of unrest enters not. This fancy, in a measure, is wrought upon fact. It reflects the contrast between our student memories and the actualities that make up our life. It means that we naturally expect both teachers and scholars to be free from many disturbances of the world outside. But fancy should not lead us too far. For this very freedom subjects the college as a whole more completely to the influence of agencies which have exerted a peculiar force during the past fifty years.

To the manifold activities of its environment, the college has given a healthy response. In the number and the choice of its professors, in the modification of its curriculum, in its material equipment and in the standing of its scholars, there has been a wisely directed progress. But to appreciate this progress, we must remember that every step in advance is a means to an end, that there is a final cause which guides the entire movement, and that this too is conceived under varying forms as new and heavier demands are made upon the college. All change, all effort and aspiration for better things, takes place in view of an ideal, and this ideal is the graduate such as his teachers would have him—the finished product who worthily represents their untiring endeavor.

What the ideal graduate shall be, is a question always uppermost in the mind of the college professor. It has of necessity a moral bearing, in view of which we ask, What manner of man shall he be who graduates here? What strength of character, what power of self-control, what love of study and what vigor of initiative is he to possess? What virtues, in a word, entitle him to a place among candidates for the priestly office? To such questions no wordy reply is needed; the answer is given in the lives of those who direct the college, whose hourly example is the most wholesome element of discipline. The one great Pattern which they copy and which they propose to their disciples, is the same yesterday, to-day and forever.

Intellectual training, on the other hand, is largely relative. Its character is determined by the actual needs which it has to meet. And as these needs vary from age to age—we might

say from decade to decade—it stands to reason that we cannot come back too often to the reconsideration, perhaps to the modification, of our ideal. To do this wisely, we must remember that education here has a double purpose; it prepares young men for the work of the seminary, but it also imparts a training which the student must carry through and beyond the seminary into his priestly life. It is by preparing its graduates for their future environment, that the college shows forth its own power of adaptation, and its ideals must therefore be formed, not in any abstract fashion, but with a clear view of the conditions which its graduates are to encounter.

The most general and yet most essential of these conditions has been established by the rapid growth of the Church during the latter half of this century, in the midst of and as a part of the growth of American democracy. This means that the clergy, far from becoming a caste, have found it their duty to enter into the very life of the people, sharing their aspirations, upholding them with the strong arm of sympathy, and intensifying the love of liberty with that reasonable obedience to law which is the safeguard of religion and of government. Such was the mission foreseen by the founders of this college—by the zealous ecclesiastic who conceived the idea, and by the patriot whose generosity hastened its realization. Such is ever the purpose of their successors in this institution. The student who enters these halls has a youthful pride in his country and an enthusiasm for her success that seldom needs stimulation, and will need it less than ever for some years to come. But the student who graduates here—the ideal graduate—has gained a rational insight into the processes, institutions and ideas to which America owes her prosperity and progress—a cultivated discernment enabling him to single out the solid enduring elements of national greatness from those that are specious and passing. With such a training—the deeper lesson of history, our graduate, though by no means a statesman, is not, on the other hand, a mere spectator of political, economic and religious movements. He has learned at any rate to look beneath the surface of things, to seek causes, to detect tendencies, to forecast their issue for good or evil. In a word, he has learned to reflect, and reflection means judgment and judgment is the soul of direction.

Among the factors in our national growth there is one which, even as a student, he must reckon with, because it directly affects his college course. Withdrawn for a time from the stress and strain of life in the world, he is none the less influenced by the development of our educational system and its far-reaching results. To appreciate these, it is not sufficient that we count the schools, colleges and universities that have sprung up during the latter half of the century, that we praise the generosity of their founders or dwell with honest pride upon their world-wide reputation. The natural consequences also—a higher level of intelligence in the people at large, higher standards for teachers and students, wider knowledge of scientific principles, increasing application of theory to the solution of practical problems—these are too obvious and too general for our present purpose. What chiefly concerns our graduate is the spread of that spirit of inquiry which, with varying degrees of accuracy, measures all things and esteems all things according to their relation with the outcome of scientific research.

Now it is true that many things are said and written in the name of science, for which there is no warrant. But how is the student to judge unless he be acquainted with the methods, the principles and the net results of science? And how shall he get that acquaintance unless he be drawn out of himself, brought into contact with nature, taught to observe closely and to think accurately? Such a knowledge of phenomenon and law gained, not merely from books, but by personal experience and practical training, is, beyond doubt, compatible with the best aspirations of the ideal graduate. He may not become a physicist or a chemist or a biologist or a mathematician. His own specialty is higher. But he has cultivated habits of mind that are invaluable. He can appreciate the magical influence of science upon the popular mind and trace that influence from its source in the university to its diffusion through every sort of literary production. He knows that the spirit of inquiry awaits him at every step, and that the questionings of science must be answered in the language of science.

He need not fear that this language is spoken by those

only who are beyond the reach of his ministrations, that it is foreign to those who share his belief. Among the men and women who were once perhaps his companions and who will one day look to him for guidance and light, not a few have been prepared for their life-work by the best institutions of the country, by courses of study that are continually adjusted to the advance of knowledge, by instructors who are specialists, perhaps by personal research in some department of science. With this class of Catholics—and it is a growing class—the graduate of St. Charles' may certainly accomplish much. He will at least appreciate the difficulties and even the doubts which scientific views so often stir up in the most loyal minds, and problems that at first sight seemed only theoretical will become of immense practical import, when their solution means the preservation of sacred beliefs.

I am well aware that the great problems just referred to are dealt with in seminary courses—that their final solution must be sought in philosophy or perhaps turned over to theology. But it is also true that no one can to-day pretend to an apprenticeship—to say nothing of a mastery—in philosophy, who has neglected his scientific training. The whole development of philosophy during the past fifty years has been towards a closer union with science; the main duty of our Christian philosophy is the proper interpretation of the laws that science establishes. And while the student of metaphysics may revel in its broad speculations, he cannot detach himself from the basis of concrete fact. If he does so, he may indeed be a college-bred man, but he is not the ideal graduate.

In urging the claims of science, we must not of course forget that over and above the operation of physical law, there are products of the human mind which no system of education can afford to neglect. There is the rich inheritance of literature, in which the imagination and thought of all ages are stored and transmitted. And to this treasure, language is the key.

In the formation of the ideal graduate linguistic study has a three-fold function :

In the first place, that study itself means a development of certain faculties that refuse the more exact discipline of the physical sciences. Hence it has always held a leading place

in education ; hence the untiring efforts of philologists to lay bare the origins and the relations of the various languages. Hence, too, the constant revision of classic texts, and what is more important, the reconstruction, by historical methods, of the circumstances under which those texts were penned. The student who has not only learned the forms and the meaning of words, but has caught the spirit of the classic writers and drawn for himself a picture of their surroundings, has used to good purpose the key of language.

In the second place, this key opens to him a vast storehouse of literature, which serves both as a means of culture and as a source of information. When we consider how much of the scientific thought of our day is given to the world in tongues other than our own, it will be evident that a knowledge of those tongues is more than an accomplishment ; it is an absolute necessity for the student. It is taken for granted, when he enters the seminary, that Latin and Greek are easy reading ; and there should be no question as to his ability to handle publications on philosophy and theology that are written in French and German. When works in these languages monopolize the library dust, there is reason to believe that the ideal graduate has not yet appeared.

In the third place—for this is an ascending scale—comes that language which, as a means of culture and as a source of information, may fairly rival the classic and modern tongues of continental Europe, but which, for the purpose of expression, is unique. The college student receives instruction through many channels, his processes of thought are complex and varied ; but the one channel through which he may hope to make his knowledge of use in this country, is the English language. The power to speak and write this clearly and forcibly is the crowning feature of college education, since it enables the graduate to react upon that environment whose influences have moulded his mind.

In our ideal, therefore, we recognize as essential traits an intelligent sympathy with the people among whom he is to labor, habits of observation and accurate thought, familiarity with the languages that are to serve as instruments of research or as the means of expression,

Now this summary is open to criticism. Hasty as the outline has been, might it not all have been shortened into two precepts—put as much as possible into the curriculum, and put as much as possible of the curriculum into the student? I do not think that the professors of this or any other college would be content with such a compendious rule. For the problem of education is not solved merely by multiplying courses of study or by lengthening the time devoted to each course; but rather by giving each study its full educational value, and by so adjusting and balancing all courses that they may produce the result desired.

This is the real aim of the educational movement and of the discussions that it calls forth. This it is that justifies the special training of each teacher and that brings about a proper division of labor among all teachers. This is the warrant for improving methods, for introducing better text-books, for applying severer tests to the student's work. This, finally, is the upward and onward endeavor of our American colleges in the realization of their best ideals.

As alumni of St. Charles', we have more than a passing interest in the development of the college. Here, in great part, are trained the men who must sooner or later take up our work. Here are fostered and perfected the vocations of which we were, in a measure, the early trustees. The work of these teachers is our work; their success is our honor. It is a work that imposes seclusion and routine, a success to be attained by vigilance and sacrifice and care. It is only just that they should find in us a steady support of sympathy and interest and coöperation. The ideal graduate may, in spite of constant approximation, remain an ideal. But the ideal alumnus should be found in every man who claims St. Charles' as his Alma Mater. What that ideal is you can best define who, in gratitude and loyalty, have come to welcome in this jubilee celebration a bright omen for the future of the college.

EDWARD A. PACE.

ED

At
Catho
ber, 1
Mgr.
presid
semin
to un
semin
which
on W
resen
Very
Semi
St. J
nati,
Murr
W.
Very
Very
Semi
Very
Jerse
were
ture
Schr
N. A
Rev.
and
Min
invi
T
thro

EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SEMINARY PRESIDENTS.

At the annual meeting of the board of trustees of the Catholic University of America, held in Washington in October, 1897, approval was given to the suggestion of Right Rev. Mgr. Conaty for the holding of a conference of seminary presidents, having as a purpose the general consideration of seminary education and the particular relation of the seminary to university training. After consultation with many of the seminary presidents, an invitation was issued for a meeting, which was held at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y., on Wednesday, May 25. The following seminaries were represented at the conference: Baltimore, St. Mary's Seminary, Very Rev. A. L. Magnien, S. S., D. D.; Boston, St. John's Seminary, Very Rev. John B. Hogan, S. S., D. D.; Brooklyn, St. John's Seminary, Very Rev. J. Sullivan, C. M.; Cincinnati, Mt. St. Mary's Seminary of the West, Very Rev. J. B. Murray, D. D.; Emmittsburg, Md., Mt. St. Mary's, Very Rev. W. L. O'Hara, D. D.; New York, St. Joseph's Seminary, Very Rev. Edward R. Dyer, S. S., D. D.; Niagara University, Very Rev. Patrick McHale, C. M.; Philadelphia, St. Charles' Seminary, Very Rev. P. J. Garvey, D. D.; San Francisco, Very Rev. A. J. B. Vuibert, S. S., D. D.; Seton Hall, New Jersey, Very Rev. J. J. Synnott, D. D. Letters of approval were read from Very Rev. J. F. Butler, O. F. M., St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Alleghany, N. Y.; Very Rev. Athanasius Schmitt, O. S. B., St. Meinrad's Seminary, Indiana; Very Rev. N. A. Moss, D. D., St. Mary's Seminary, Cleveland; Very Rev. Francis V. Nugent, C. M., Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis, and Very Rev. P. R. Heffron, D. D., St. Paul Seminary, Minnesota. The professors of St. Joseph's Seminary were invited to attend and take part in the conference.

The proceedings opened at 10 o'clock and continued throughout the day. Right Rev. Mgr. Conaty presided and

Very Rev. W. L. O'Hara, of Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, acted as secretary. Mgr. Conaty made the opening address, which the conference unanimously asked to have published. The matter of organization was discussed, and it was voted to form a permanent organization, to be known as "The Educational Conference of Seminary Faculties." Committees were appointed to discuss topics relative to seminary work, as also the relations of the seminaries to the University in the higher education of the clergy. It was felt that this first conference was more in the nature of a preparation for future work. A standing committee, consisting of the Very Revs. A. L. Magnien, P. J. Garvey, P. McHale and J. B. Murray, was appointed to take charge of the work of the next conference, and to invite all seminary faculties to attend and become members. The Very Rev. L. Colin, Superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Montreal, was present as a guest of the conference, and in his address he emphasized very strongly the importance of such a conference for the proper discussion of educational work, and the importance of proper preparation for the superior education in the University. Very Rev. E. J. Purbrick, S. J., Provincial of the Jesuits, was also asked to address the conference, and gave a most interesting and detailed account of the work of the educational conference in England, in which he had so large a part. He urged very strongly the importance of an educational conference as a means of better acquaintance among teachers, and a more perfect systematizing of educational work.

The conference voted to hold the next meeting in Philadelphia, at St. Charles' Seminary, the 1st of September, 1899. To this conference seminary professors, as well as the presidents, will be invited.

The members of the conference were entertained by the president and faculty of St. Joseph's Seminary, and among the guests present at dinner were : Most Rev. Archbishop Corrigan, Fathers Purbrick, Provincial of the Jesuits ; L. Colin, president of St. Sulpice Seminary, Montreal ; T. J. Campbell, S. J., president of St. John's College, Fordham, New York, and Brother Justin, superior of the Christian Brothers. The

conference held several sessions during the day, and adjourned at 8 o'clock P. M., to meet in Philadelphia, September, 1899.

ADDRESS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND RECTOR.

VERY REV. AND REV. FATHERS: In calling this meeting to order, I cannot help congratulating you upon the generosity with which the demand for it has been met by those in charge of our seminary education. The presence of so many superiors of the theological institutions gives evidence of an earnest interest in all that tends to advancement in the education of the clergy.

This conference is the outgrowth of a feeling, more or less defined, that our educational system calls for an organization in which the leaders of our educational thought may meet to discuss the means and methods by which the best results in education may be attained. Happily we have reached the day when the Church in this country is prepared to give answer to the educational demands of all classes of our people. Schools, colleges, seminaries and universities are found in different sections of our country, thoroughly equipped in the interest of a profounder and more extensive knowledge. Yet, though many of them are in excellent condition and well prepared for the work which they undertake to do, there is on all sides a consciousness that the work is being done by independent and individual units, without that cohesiveness which comes from the unity of purpose and the harmony of parts.

To bring together representatives of those educational agencies, to effect a harmonizing of all parts of the system, cannot be without good results; for at least it will serve to introduce men to one another, open up discussions upon topics of common interest, give an opportunity to compare methods and develop a proper feeling as to the best way of attaining the greatest good in education. Besides all that, there is the need of organization that we may realize that our different schools are not disjointed elements of a system, but that one hinges upon the other, and that all should be closely bound together, in order the better to move in solid phalanx in the interests of knowledge and religion.

In studying the different phases of our educational life, it occurred to me that a movement toward a conference such as this would be productive of great good. In an experience of twenty-five years, it has been my privilege to come in contact with all classes of educational work, and it has always seemed to me that there has been lacking a spirit of organization of our different forces, which has interfered with our general success. This thought prompted me to suggest, at the meeting of the trustees of the University last October, the feasibility of an

educational conference, first with the directors of seminaries, and afterwards with the rectors of colleges, to discuss the general aims and purposes of education, to consider and compare methods and to study out the question of organization. This suggestion met with the favor of the trustees, and as a result you are gathered here.

This conference, as the first of its kind among us, must be more in the nature of preparation for future methodical and systematic work. One of its objects must be to study the necessity and importance, as well as a method, of organization, so that we must look forward to subsequent conferences for the results we desire. The most we can do now is to establish the principle of an educational conference, which in the years to come will bear practical fruit.

My relation to this conference is largely that of one who presumes to call men together, and at least set in motion the machinery, by virtue of which a power may be generated which will be productive of substantial educational good. We come together as friends of the higher education of the clergy. Upon us devolves the responsibility of shaping and moulding the future religious leaders of our people; and we draw our inspiration from the spirit of work for the greater glory of God and the interests of religion in the United States. Now that the work of education in this country finds its culmination and its crown in the Catholic University, established by the Holy See at the earnest demand of the bishops in council assembled, it seems proper that a conference of seminary presidents, such as this, may also give careful consideration to the true relations which should exist between the University and the seminary as well as all the other parts of the system of which the University is the head.

We have reached the time in our church life when ecclesiastical scholarship, in the true sense of the word, is demanded of us. To effect that scholarship, to make it more general, to place it within the call of our earnest and ambitious young clerics, should be the aim and object of our work, as well as the desire of our hearts, and every branch of the system should be made to contribute, in a perfect form, its portion to the great whole, which should find its complete perfection in the graduate of the University. A two-fold relation presents itself to us; first, the relation of the seminary to the University and the consequent preparation which the seminary should make for university work; and, second, the standard of seminary work which the university requirements demand, which latter would lead to a consideration of the program of studies necessary for such a standard.

UNIVERSITY AND SEMINARY.

The University and the seminary are closely bound to one another; one is built upon the other, and both are built upon the college. The University is not something far away and standing by itself, with pretensions which ignore the existence of other educational agencies. It is an integral part of the system, closely bound up with and depending upon the other parts. The same blood courses through its veins, the same interests actuate its life, the same aims and purposes bind it to success. It leads to greater heights the men whom the other parts of the system have equipped for the work of climbing. Its students come from college and seminary; its graduates often go back to college and seminary as valuable aids in the work of preparation. It is not independent—indeed it is very dependent. No one among you is without close relation to the public life of the clergy and the laity, and all realize the demands of education, as also the vast increasing needs of the Church—needs that are constantly pressing, especially in our day and generation. As the number of priests increases in our dioceses, the opportunities for wider and deeper study must necessarily present themselves to our talented young ecclesiastics.

The day of so-called pioneer work in the Church, especially in our eastern section, is over; in fact, we may say that the day of material church building is practically over. We have reached the point where it becomes necessary to develop the intellectual and social qualities of our people, as well as the religious. Our young cleric must be prepared to meet the issues of the hour—issues no longer between the true Church of Christ and the sects, but between revealed religion and all forms of agnosticism and false individualism. He must be equipped to defend science against so-called scientific unbelief, to answer all the questions of intellectual and scientific thought, to maintain the perfect harmony that exists between religion and science, to enter the fields of history and archæology in defense of the Church, to protect and preserve the Word of God in this day of Biblical criticism, against the iconoclasm of sectaries. He must also be prepared to enter into the field of social and economic reform, to take a leading part in prison and reformatory work, and to be an element in all charitable endeavors. The battle of the future is to be a philosophical battle, as well as scientific and historical. It will be a defense of the very foundations of belief.

Scholarship is demanded in the leaders who are commissioned to defend the truth. The time has come when the scholarship of the clergy should give to the Church that bril-

liancy which shone forth in the scholarship of past ages. This scholarship should find expression in polished writing as well as in elegant speech. We need writers as well as preachers. To send forth finished scholars, it is necessary that the groundwork be well done; that school and college and seminary train the youth on lines that will furnish proper material for the university finishing.

I may be permitted to state here what appears to the University to be the relations which it holds toward the seminaries. No clearer statement can be made than that which appears in the words of our holy father, Leo XIII, in his apostolic letter of March 7, 1889, to the episcopate of the United States. He said: "We exhort you to endeavor to have your seminaries, colleges, and other Catholic institutions of learning affiliated to the University, as is suggested in its statutes, leaving, nevertheless, a perfect freedom of action; *omnium tamen libertate salva et incolumi.*" We see clearly the mind of the holy father, that all the different parts of our educational system should be affiliated with and lead to the University. This is expressed in the general constitutions of the University, chapter 8, number 4: "Colleges or seminaries, without losing their independence, may be affiliated to the University by the authority of the board of trustees, in which case the diplomas granted by these institutions will entitle the holders of them to admission to the University."

PREPARATION FOR THE UNIVERSITY.

Established as the University has been for the higher education of the clergy and laity, it stands to-day prepared to do university work in the true sense of the word. It is neither a seminary nor a college—in this sense at least: that it does not aim to, nor is it prepared to, do the work for which the seminary and the college exist. In the true university sense, it aims to begin where both college and seminary leave off. Unfortunately, for good work, the University is often obliged to make up for the defects of both seminary and of college, and thus waste valuable time both of teacher and of scholar. The reason of these defects, in my judgment, may often be found in the imperfect understanding of the relations which the different institutions hold to one another. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the work of the University is not a repetition, even in a more scholarly way or on a broader scale, of the work done in the seminary or in the college. A leading idea of the University is specialization, and this has rather to do with the development and specializing of certain branches

and the giving of superior training in them. Not all the students of the University are called to be specialists. Only the very few can ever hope to realize that ambition. For the most part, all that the University can be expected to do is to incline men to serious study, and thus fit them for practical work in their dioceses. We cannot hope to find in the many a taste for special research, but we can and do hope that all will be taught to be accurate in what they know and thus acquire a certain perfect formation, while a few will be attracted to specialization. The University aims to broaden and develop the spirit of scholarship—in fact to make scholars—men of research, capable of distinguishing the true from the false, no matter in what disguise error may appear, knowing how to reach the source of information and make accurate every statement. Hence the necessity of good general theological culture on the part of those who enter as students of the faculty of theology. This general culture is a necessary basis for serious and successful special studies, whether in the field of theology, of history, or of sacred scripture. It is important to have the spirit of scholarship developed in college and seminary training, the love of learning for learning's sake, that taste which goes far toward forming the scholar.

It is not necessary to emphasize the conclusion reached by every one who considers the situation, namely, that the student coming from the seminary to the University should have an excellent training in philosophy, dogma, moral theology, Church history, and a general introduction to sacred scripture. He should be prepared to enter into the workshop of the University, there to be taught how to use to the best advantage the tools with which his seminary life have made him familiar—the tools that will permit him to carve for himself a special place in any department of ecclesiastical science. He should be prepared to begin work which will have the stamp of his own individuality, that thus he may begin to fit himself to contribute to the fund of the world's knowledge. He ought to be skilled in the use both of Greek and Latin and in the elements of Hebrew, as these are the languages that contain the original documents of all his studies. He should not be satisfied with what is handed down to him by translation, but as a scholar he should be prepared to study the originals. It is also highly desirable that there should be a knowledge of French and German, because these languages contain what is regarded as the best modern theological literature, most of which has not as yet been translated into English.

The papers for the baccalaureate examination express the conditions which the University considers requisite, in order

that an ecclesiastic may matriculate for university degrees. The question has been sometimes discussed as to whether these requirements are beyond the standard reached by the seminaries, and whether a better dovetailing of the work may be made. A conference like this will go far towards answering such questions intelligently.

There is no doubt that the omission of certain studies in seminaries acts as a serious handicap upon a student coming to a university that requires those studies as a foundation for its special work. Every one will realize the difficulty of the student when presenting himself for special studies in Holy Scripture, who has never studied Hebrew in the seminary and has forgotten what little Greek he learned in the college. He may be a brilliant student, and may become a fair exegete, but with his brilliant talents and satisfactory work what tremendous advantages would be within his reach, were he capable of reading the text in the original Hebrew or Greek! The same is true as far as the Greek and Latin are concerned in the study of Church history, while French and German give an entrée to-day, not only to science, but also to the best theological literature. If we are in earnest, then, to lead the clergy of the Church in America to the heights of scholarship, we must see to the foundations, as also to the general educational structure upon which scholarship is to be built.

GROWTH OF THE UNIVERSITY.

This is the message of the University to the seminaries in this conference. It is a word of encouragement and a word of advice. The University is the highest expression of the Church in education, and to us Americans, our University should be the pride and idol of our hearts. It was a bold step on the part of the bishops to inaugurate the University; but the educational system was not complete until the University was established. Like all institutions, the University is of slow growth; that which springs into being in a night often-times fades and withers before the morning sun. It has taken many years to develop our seminaries and place them upon the splendid footing of to-day. Like them, the University is not merely for our day and generation, it has been built for the centuries. It is as yet in its youth, and must experience all the difficulties that come with youth. Yet in looking over the nine years that separate us from its first scholastic days, we have no reason to be ashamed of the position it occupies in the higher education of the clergy and the laity. It has not done all that it has wished to do, because, on the one hand, some of the work that came to it for perfection was imperfectly done,

and on the other, many of its students could not be spared from their dioceses long enough to give them time for proper university development. Yet more than two hundred priests have passed through the University; nearly sixty have received its licentiate, and two hold its doctorate. Others could have reached the honors of the University doctorate, if they could have been spared from their dioceses for the years needed to undertake the severe labor which it demands.

It is encouraging to note that there are now three students who are preparing for their doctorate in theology, which they hope to secure at the end of another year. Among its graduates are found men who are to-day doing glorious work for the Church in different sections of the country, and adding honor to the degrees which the University bestowed upon them.

The time has come now, and the University is better prepared than ever, to take a step forward to still better work for the clergy and laity of the United States; but it needs the continued co-operation of the seminaries and the colleges; it needs the touch that gives ambition for work as well as direction; it needs the friendliness that comes with the kindly word of direction and the conscientious co-operation in the preparation for the work. We should be proud that we have in our country an institution capable of doing as good work as any institution of the kind in the world; that it is no longer necessary that our students go abroad for higher development, but that our own Catholic University stands at our very doors to give us the very best possible scientific training in university lines. Clergymen from our own dioceses, having fitted themselves by the best training in Europe, stand ready to lead our young men to the loftiest heights of ecclesiastical learning.

The University welcomes the day of this conference, and rejoices that through its deliberations we may hope for a more uniform standard of seminary training, as well as more complete development of seminary work on lines that will lead to general theological culture, making our young men not only pious priests and good theologians, but masters of their own language and cultured gentlemen, worthy to be presented to their bishops as candidates for the highest scholarship, thus to become in their day the ornaments of the Church, as well as the teachers of the people.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THEOLOGY.

A Manual of Catholic Theology, based on Scheeben's "Dogmatik," by Joseph Wilhelm, Ph. D., and Thomas B. Scannell, B. D., vol. II. The Fall, Redemption, Grace; The Church and the Sacraments; The Last Things. New York: Benziger Bros., 1898. 8°, pp. 566, \$4.00 net.

Every educated Catholic layman, who cares for a scientific knowledge of the teachings of the Catholic Church, should possess this book. It is an adaptation, in English dress, of a well known and favorite manual of Catholic theology. For some time there has been a marked tendency to present Catholic truth in languages that the modern man can understand and appreciate, and we have already had occasion to call attention in these pages to several commendable works of this nature. The work of Fathers Wilhelm and Scannell is without doubt the most perfect of the kind. The doctrine is sure, the salient points well chosen, the divisions natural and historical. The disposition of exposé, proofs and objections is marked by a good sense of proportions and reserve, which permits the housing of a vast deal of accurate knowledge within a comparatively small space.

The priest is familiar with many theologies, in Latin or other tongues; theology is the substance of his Mass and breviary; his conversation and reading naturally take the same course. But the layman of culture has not had such advantages; the catechism, the religious weekly, the sermon, an occasional stiff translation of some antiquated work—this has been all the pabulum offered to him outside of the vast polemics of the day. Is it too much to hope that the new theological literature will be largely in the English vernacular, imitating in that the almost universal practice of our German Catholic brethren, and even of the French. Indeed, the work of Scheeben was itself written in German.

The modern vernaculars are mighty engines of influence. The future is to them; they are charged with the experiences, the sympathies, the hopes, the peculiar idealism of these last epoch-making centuries. They cannot, it is true, cut loose from the classic tongues, whose life and spirit and power and charm overlap them on all sides, and are forever blended with them. Nevertheless, they have their own genius and raciness, their own short and rapid transit to the modern heart. The supple elegance of the French, the mysticism and gravity of the German, the measure and the music of the Italian, the manifold composite efficacy of the English, with its rainbow-like blending of excellencies—all these dispute successfully with the Latin and the Greek the palm of literary merit. Every one of them is forming to some future greatness the peoples of its bailiwick, with the same intensity and thoroughness as the Latin formed to majesty the rude tiller of the Campanian soil, or the Greek to grace and harmony the "grasshoppers" of Athens. Now, theology has the right to, and the need of, literary perfection. Not the least charm of the Bible is in the solemn rhythm of the psalm and the sublime imagery of the prophets, whereby, with Orphic skill, the hearts of men are ravished Godwards, and made a heavenly booty. Language is the surest exponent of the popular ethos. Through the slow-treading centuries, and the endless vicissitudes of men and things, it bears, conservative at once and progressive, the institutions, habits, impulses and longings of its adherents. Hence, theology, like all other branches of literature, must speak with perfection the language of the people it would dominate. Can any one doubt that the literary skill of Origen counted for much in the Christian proselytism of the third century, or that the English-speaking churches have laid up in the classicism of Newman one of their most powerful attractions in the coming century? Are not Bossuet and Fénelon and Massillon and Bourdaloue a safe harbor for the faith of the venerable churches of France, of more immediate value than the Latin mystics of Clairvaux and Saint Victor?

Far be it from us to disparage the rights and the uses of the Latin tongue! Too long has it served the indispensable purposes of administration, worship, doctrine and communion, as

an instrument of teaching, to set it aside. Too intimately is it united with the ordinary life of the Church, and too many are the solemn uses made of it by the Holy Spirit. So true is this, that were it to disappear, we should need to reconstruct its ruins in order to fully understand the life of the Christian Church. It is, indeed, as Gregory Thaumaturgus long since expressed himself in the presence of Origen, "a wonderful and magnificent sort of language, and one very aptly conformable to imperial authority." De Maistre called it "*le signe Européen*," meaning thereby that it stood for all the religion, culture and letters of the Old World. Nor is it worn out or helpless, though it has strangely outlived itself, and found a second and imperishable life on the lips of men it once doomed to extinction. In its secular rivalry with the Greek, it has shown that it was made of sterner and severer stuff, and that it could lose pliancy and elegance and all its sorely-earned portion of "eurythmy" without breaking up its manly vigor, its bluff directness, and that certain haunting echo of the imperious bugle, that fierce compelling cry to arms that filled with horror the breasts of the rude ancestors of modern Europe. Alone it can fill the demand for a universal tongue of commerce and administration. Alone it may yet enter upon a third stadium of influence and power when at some future date

super et Garamantas et Indos
Proferet imperium.

There are some improvements we could wish in a future edition of this excellent manual. It would be well to distinguish the principal paragraphs in each chapter by salient catchwords in strong dark type. The volume of doctrine might be increased by introducing into the text, in smaller type, paragraphs devoted to the literary history of many doctrines, the evolution of defence and illustration, the minor domestic or foreign polemics aroused about them from time to time. This might as well be done in foot-notes or excursus. A more extensive modern literature would be greatly welcomed, including not only the best books printed by Catholics, but a suitable selection of works from non-Catholic sources. Where the authors have used the latest and best editions of the text

of the Fathers, e. g., those editions of the Latin Fathers so far issued by the Academy of Vienna, we would like to see the fact noted. Indeed, a full bibliography, after the manner of that preceding the volumes of Janssen's History of the German People, would greatly enhance the utility of this manual.

PHILOSOPHY.

Motion: Its Origin and Conservation. Rev. Walter McDonald, D. D. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1898; pp. xi + 457.

The author's chief purpose is to vindicate for himself and for Catholic professors generally, "the right to teach in accordance with the kinetic theory of activity, whatever may be the science on which they are engaged—physics, metaphysics, theology, or anything else." The commonly held dynamic theory recognizes in the production of motion four really distinct entities: the substance of the agent, the faculty of moving, the "force" exerted while the agent is in motion, and the movement that ensues. Motion therefore "does not pass from one agent into another without losing its individuality, but is produced *de novo* in every object that begins to move." According to the kinetic theory, "there is no such thing as 'force' really distinct from the permanent faculty and the motion which is caused therein. The motion of the faculty is itself the only force, activity, action, formal cause of efficient causality. And motion passes quite readily from one agent into another without losing its individuality." It is this latter view that Dr. McDonald adopts as the basis of his speculation throughout the essay.

In this sense he interprets the teaching of Aristotle and St. Thomas. Modern physicists are also called in as witnesses, not to establish the truth of the kinetic theory, but to show that the tendency now is in its favor; a noteworthy symptom being the disposition to give up completely the form of energy lately known as "potential" or "energy of position." Similarly, in examining the intrinsic evidence, the author aims, not so much to defend the theory itself, as to show that it is not at variance with Catholic teaching.

After warding off the charge of occasionalism which dyna-

mists urge against the kinetic theory, he proceeds to a detailed analysis of the concepts on which the theory is based. It is possible here to give but a summary of what is contained in the chapters on Continuity, Resistance and Attraction. Motion, though an accident, is transferred from subject to subject, because the two subjects become by contact really, though incompletely, one individual. The problem, then, is to explain the manner in which motion passes within a continuous mass. This passage is not due to any force which is really distinct from motion. "All that is required is that the parts should be impenetrable, and that some one should be moved in the direction of the others; which means that it should be conserved in existence or continuously created by God, in a place previously occupied by one of the other parts of the mass." The allied phenomena of attraction are still shrouded for the most part in mystery; but the promise of their final explanation is held out by the kinetic rather than by the dynamic theory.

To understand the production of accidental forms a distinction is necessary. All the accidents found in a creature at the first instant of its existence are concreated with the substance; God is the sole efficient cause. When, subsequently, transmutation takes place, the causes are God and the created substance. As to substantial forms, God is the only efficient physical cause of their eduction; the operation of the created agent is restricted to the production in matter of accidental dispositions to which the various species of substantial forms are immediately due.

Living things are those which move themselves or are moved independently of any external created cause from which their movements may proceed, but not independently of a previous action on the part of God, whereby these spontaneous motions are excited within the vital faculties. Those vital actions which proceed from the will require also a divine premotion. Freedom of the will essentially consists not in a power of passing at pleasure from inactivity to action, without being moved by any other agent, nor in any faculty of determining a general motion to a particular direction, but in the capacity of abstaining from a motion once received.

The dynamic theory dispenses with the necessity of divine coöperation in the action of creatures ; it moreover lessens the force of one of the principal arguments for the existence of God. This argument is based on the inability of the material universe to produce a new substance or a new force, and on the fact that substances and forces have been and are continually being produced. The dynamist is not in a position to uphold this argument against the evolutionist and the materialist.

From this outline it is clear that Dr. McDonald's theory emphasizes the Catholic teaching in regard to God's activity in the universe, while it would eliminate forces distinct from created faculty. The far-reaching character of his propositions is obvious. It obliges him to touch on matters that have long been the subject of theological controversy. In so doing, however, his intention is to set forth certain fundamental principles rather than to decide any of the issues. His essay is, for the most part, philosophical. That there are difficulties in the application of the kinetic theory, he frankly admits. Qualitative changes, especially such as mental processes, necessitate a recourse to analogy ; they are motions, but are not true local disturbances. In regard also to the origin of mechanical motion, from the standpoint of science, the results of speculation are unsatisfactory. But so far as the conditions of the vast problem permit, Dr. McDonald's attempt at a solution is interesting. The kinetic theory may or may not be true ; but since its rôle in modern scientific thought is so important, the Christian philosopher should understand its bearings and enlist it, so far as possible, in the service of philosophic truth.

Les Origines de la Psychologie Contemporaine. D. Mercier, Louvain, Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1897. Pp. x+486.

Under the direction of Mgr. Mercier, the Institut Supérieur de Philosophie at Louvain, founded by Leo XIII, has rendered excellent service to the cause of the new scholasticism. Its work consists not merely in repeating and reprinting the language of the schoolmen, but rather in giving new vigor to scholastic philosophy by bringing its principles into contact with modern thought. The *Revue Néo Scholastique*, now in

its fifth year, and the growing *Bibliothèque*, comprising publications on the most varied and most important philosophical subjects, are evidences that the Institut takes its work seriously. Its progressive spirit is further shown by the adoption of modern methods, especially in psychology, for which a laboratory and regular courses of experiment are provided. In psychology, however, as in every other science, beside the investigation of particular problems, we have to recognize the influence of certain leading and guiding ideas, which, when traced to their sources, reveal the origin of the science as it now exists.

The study which Mercier gives us in this volume is historical, but it is also critical in the true sense of that term. It points out the defects of various systems, yet shows a high appreciation of individual thinkers and a readiness to accept their contributions to knowledge. The scholastic philosophy is held to be the best interpretation of the facts brought to light by experimental psychology, but the possibility and the necessity of developing scholasticism is also made clear. Adherence to any system means that "it is considered, on the whole, as the most adequate expression of truth, but not that it is a finished monument before which the mind has only to wrap itself in an ecstasy of sterile contemplation."

The fundamental thesis of scholastic psychology is that man is one substance, composed of matter and of an immaterial soul. This unity Descartes failed to comprehend; hence, on the one hand, an exaggerated spiritualism, and, on the other, a mechanical explanation of all extra-mental phenomena. From these Cartesian sources, Mercier traces the evolution of idealism, positivism and modern mechanicism. Turning then to the psychology of the day as expounded by Spencer, Fouillée and Wundt, he finds in it three general characteristics: its object is limited to the facts of consciousness, it abandons metaphysics for monism, and it attaches a growing importance to psychological experiment.

As an offset to these tendencies, historical and actual, we have an outline of Aristotelian and scholastic anthropology, followed by a critical examination of the principles of idealism, mechanicism and positivism. The closing chapter of the

book gives an interesting account of the modern Thomistic movement, and two appendices furnish statistical information concerning the teaching of philosophy and experimental psychology.

It is chiefly the philosophical factors in this development that Mercier discusses; and he consequently leads his reader very far into the broad fields of metaphysics and epistemology. Without detriment to this plan, more emphasis might have been laid on the progress of sciences like physiology and physics, which have certainly had a share in the growth of modern psychology. Again, in pointing out the general characteristics of the science, our author mentions but one of the methods at present employed. Experiment, it is true, has yielded good results; but the application of the genetic method is no less important. The student, however, who wishes to get clear notions on the modern philosophy of mind and its origin will find this work useful. Its closing exhortation, urging Catholic philosophers to take an active interest in experimental psychology, is significant and instructive.

Christian Philosophy: A Treatise on the Human Soul. Rev. John T. Driscoll, S. T. L. Albany: James B. Lyon, 1898. Pp. xiii + 269.

The problems discussed in this volume are of paramount importance. Their solution, by general consent, is to be sought in the domain of philosophy. With many systems to choose from, Father Driscoll adopts that which is "enunciated in the catechism and systematized by the schoolmen, especially St. Thomas." He is, however, aware that the progress of psychology and the kindred sciences has produced an extensive literature, and his acquaintance with it is evidenced by frequent citations and references, which, in spite of some misspelling, will be helpful to the reader. To the new department of psycho-physics, he attaches little importance, being convinced that "its real aim and influence are materialistic." This view, of course, is not shared by the majority of those who actually employ experimental methods in psychology. Few, in fact, would care to make the large concession that the existence of psycho-physics as a science "is to materialists the

one direct proof of their position." And every one will agree with our author that "science, sifted of all imaginations and assumptions, vindicates the contention of sound philosophy and proclaims the true dignity of man." Quite in accord with this statement is the section devoted to the relation between thought and brain structure. On this point, the findings of anatomy, physiology and anthropology are accepted and turned to profit, though the finders were not all imbued with spiritualistic philosophy.

The arrangement of the work is orderly, and each chapter is well divided. Various theories are stated concisely and subjected to criticism. The historical summaries are a good feature, and occasional extracts show that poetry has its place even in philosophic discussions. The value of the book as a manual would be greater if the running head indicated the subject of each chapter, and if the list of contents at the beginning gave a clue to the pagination.

HISTORY.

Armellini. *Lezioni di Archeologia Cristiana, Opera Postuma*, Rome, 1898. Cuggiani, 8vo., pp. 649, with portrait of the author.

For fifty years the soil of Rome, Italy, France, Germany, Spain, and the ancient Christian Orient has been giving up, in abundance and variety, the monuments of Christian antiquity, chiefly those of a funerary character. Old libraries and archives have yielded not a little, and the early ecclesiastical writers, re-read in the new light thus obtained, have been scarcely less generous than catacomb or manuscript. As a result, there is a new science asking for admission to the programs of our faculties of theology in seminary and university,—the science of Christian Archæology.

Quite an array of books, mostly adaptations of De Rossi's *Roma Sotteranea*, exists, in which the results of the catacomb excavations may be found. Special treatises on many interesting points have exhausted the pertinent archæological materials. But there was still wanting a satisfactory guide or manual which would induct the curious into a scientific intelligence of the known materials, and give them an insight into

the history of the science and the methods of its creators. No more praiseworthy attempt has been made than the publication of this posthumous work of Signor Mariano Armellini, long associated with De Rossi as a co-laborer in the excavation of the catacombs and the interpretation of their monuments.

The subject-matter of the book falls under the five heads, Christianity and the Contemporary Society, the Cemeteries, the Christian Art of the Cemeteries, Church Discipline, Christian Inscriptions. Under the first rubric are gathered the indications furnished by Christian archæology as to the spread of Christianity, and its relations with the Roman nobility and the synagogue. Then follows an account of the professions and trades among the Christians, their posts of honor, the names, honorable and opprobrious, given them, baptismal names, the dress of the faithful,—in a word, a picture of the “Church of the Brethren” before Constantine. Under the title of Cemeteries we have a general account of the burial-places of the ancient Christians, their origin, number, nature and administration. The best known of these cemeteries are then described at length, and a better, more accurate guide could nowhere be found. The Art of the Early Christians, ornamental, symbolic, biblical, allegorical, dogmatic, is explained at length in the third section of the work. In the fourth, the author has collected a multitude of archæological evidences as to the use of the sacraments and sacramentals, the liturgy, the hierarchy, the consecrated virgins, the Church chant, and the like. Finally, in the section devoted to Christian Inscriptions—the chief source of our archæological knowledge—we learn of the status of persons in the Christian society; of the form, dates, and other peculiarities of Christian inscription, and certain criteria, general and special, by which they may be recognized as distinct from the Gentile inscriptions.

It will be seen that we have here a new chapter in the history of theology—nothing less than the archæology of theology, what is sometimes called, with more or less justice, monumental theology. Had Armellini lived to edit this valuable book, no doubt he would have added some much-needed improvements—chapters on the history of the science, on its peculiar methods and their evolution, on its sources and its lit-

erature, on its relations to profane archæology, Church history, dogmatic theology, and patrology. Many sections of the book would have been enlarged, and a great many minor defects apparent to the scientific reader would have disappeared.

As it lies before us, the book is made up from the lecture-notes of Armellini, who taught this science at the Propaganda and Sant'Apollinare; it wants, therefore, the *cachet* of his genius, being only the skeleton of the science as this master had conceived it. Withal, it is a step in advance, and may well encourage others to something more perfect by utilizing the material so patiently gathered and sifted. Theological students will feel themselves indebted to Signor Asproni for the publication of his friend's useful handbook. They also owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. E. Stevenson, Jr., for the preparatory letter in which he calls attention to the nature and value of this attractive science, refutes the objections urged against it, and shows the real utility of it for the study of historical theology, as well as for political and institutional history.

The life of Armellini was laborious and saintly, mostly spent in the bowels of the earth, away from the earth's turmoil. It is a strangely peaceful face, lit up by some inner mystic joy, that looks out at us from the frontispiece. Surely he had caught something of the spirit of deep mental rest that seems the chief characteristic of the typical Christian before Constantine. How often it comes back, *Vixit in pace, In pace quievit!* Over their heads were agitated the interests of nations and kingdoms. The envoys of a hundred peoples, a thousand cities, hastened feverishly by the modest entrances to those abodes of a peace more secure than the Pax Romana they were seeking. While the spade of the Christian fossor was undermining the soil of vineyard and olive grove, the doctrine of the Christian priest was burrowing through ancient society and noiselessly exploding its vanities and follies, its hollow pomp and its weak defenses of tradition and interest. It was then and there that were laid on the bodies and in the blood of the martyrs the deep foundations of triumphant Christianity. The latter is built upon many tiers of lives

joyously sacrificed that the society might live. No wonder that its vigor seems undying, its sap exhaustless !

We trust this introduction to early Church history, dogmatic theology, the science of the Fathers, the institutions of Christianity, will be read by many priests and laymen. It will surely rouse the zeal of the former, enliven the faith of the latter, and increase in both the warmth of Christian charity.

The Formation of Christendom. By T. W. Allies, K. C. S. G.
Vol. IV. As Seen in Church and State. New York: Benziger Bros., 1898, 8°, pp. 452. \$1.35.

Mr. Allies is a philosophic historian. His work is already a classic ; and this new and handy edition will be welcome to all who have been instructed and elevated by the pages of this beautiful book. In profoundness and accuracy of philosophical and theological thought, it compares favorably with any of the modern Catholic writers on the subject. The volumes of M. de Broglie on "Church and State in the Fourth Century," are not superior. The student must not look in such a work for the detail of the narrative. Only the leading facts, the great visible outlines, the large framework, are brought into view. Such histories are written to illustrate and justify, on a great scale, the conduct and principles of a vast society stretching over many centuries, and extending its operations throughout the whole world. Of course there is room for improvement; the Catholic writer has yet to appear who will combine the minuteness of a Gibbon with his splendor of style, his compactness of description, and his shrewdness of comment. In the meantime, the work of Mr. Allies is valuable for both priest and layman. There was a time when it might be thought beyond the grasp of the latter—one would scarcely maintain that now.

The present volume opens with the prophetic kingdom of Daniel as interpreted by St. Augustine, to whose school Mr. Allies belongs. The relations between this spiritual power and the civil power are discussed, as they existed before and after Christ. In these chapters the reader will find useful instructions on several great fundamental human institu-

tions. The transmission of this spiritual power by Jesus Christ to His Apostles, and their establishment of it on earth, and particularly in the Roman empire (A. D. 29-325), take up the rest of the volume. Here we have not properly a history of the early Church, but rather a philosophic-historical discussion of its foundation based on the principal testimonies, of the episcopal character of the earliest communities, and the divine appointment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the life-center of the new society. The divine independence of this society is shown by the growth *ad intra* of its own institutions of administration, and by its assertion of its own specific teachings, positively and negatively, notably by its conflicts with Judaism, heresy, idolatry, philosophy and the Roman state.

It is a pity that such a laborious work should not be provided with indications of the extensive literature, ancient and modern. When the modern student undertakes to read a work *de longue haleine*, he expects to be repaid not only by the perusal of the writer's own views, but also by the exhibition of the genetic process by which he acquired them, or by the knowledge of the authors, old and new, who helped to form his opinions. The exhibition of such a literature is not a matter of vanity; it is a matter of justice to the reader, who has a right to form his opinions independently of the *ipse dixit* of the author. Moreover, such a custom would encourage many to go farther, and develop more specially individual points or questions, besides bringing to the knowledge of the busy a number of excellent books or articles that had otherwise escaped their notice.

Geffroy, *Etudes Italiennes*, Colin et Cie, Paris, 1898, 8°, pp. 309.

Rome and Florence furnish the material of this volume of literary remains of the late M. Geffroy, director of the French School of History and Archæology at Rome. Studies on the great Medici, Savonarola, and Guicciardini; on the monuments of Rome in the Middle Ages; the legend of Beatrice Cenci; the Piranesi as collectors of monuments, and the vandalism of the modern Italian administrators of the city, make a very interesting volume, none the less valuable that some of them have already appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*,

to which M. Geffroy had long been a contributor. Notably good are the papers on Savonarola and Guicciardini, in which the former's sincerity of purpose and singleness of heart are set forth in a clear light, while the latter's weakness of character and moral obliquity are brought out in a relief no less striking than his rare literary genius and his unequalled talent for fine and accurate observation. The volume is also commendable for the justice with which it abates the anti-papal elements of the legend of Beatrice Cenci, whereby the poem of Shelley and the romance of Guerrazzi must be henceforth expunged from the list of literary monuments based on facts and genuine documents.

EDUCATION.

Harrent, *Les Ecoles d'Antioche, Essai sur le savior et l'enseignement en Orient au IV^e siècle après J. C.* par Albert Harrent, Paris, Fontemoing, 8° pp. 288.

In six chapters M. Harrent offers us a picture of the school life of Antioch in the fourth century of the Christian era. We learn about the establishment of schools, their morality and discipline, the share of state and individual, the freedom of competition. Grammar and rhetoric were the chief teaching—only by grammar was understood a complete literary formation on the Greek classics, and by rhetoric a detailed schooling in the almost infinite art of public speaking. Add to this the special studies, such as music (with dancing and gymnastics), arithmetic and algebra, geometry, astronomy and astrology, alchemy, medicine, law, philosophy, and mythology, and we have the widest limits ever reached by the school teaching of the ancient world. Chapters on the influences of the family and the pedagogue, on the masters (rhetoricians, sophists and philosophers) and on the public office of rhetoric and the rhetoricians, in the ancient society, complete the book, whose subject-matter is one of the most instructive that the history of institutions can offer. The writings of Libanius furnish the material for this description of academic life in the Syrian Orient, between the death of Constantine the Great and the death of Theodosius the Great—a century of far-reaching political events, big with transformations of every kind, more or

less hastened by the decay and abandonment of one religion and the substitution for it in state and society of another. M. Harrent is an enthusiastic admirer of the splendid sophist, the teacher of men like Chrysostom and Basil, the apostle of the fine Hellenic sense of order and measure in life, of that sure correct taste which lends to thought and act both dignity and moderation, and begets in the mind of every beholder the consciousness of moral beauty. This moral beauty, say the sophists and the rhetoricians, is enough to still all disorder of the appetites, all rebellion of impulse, all waywardness of nature. The consideration and the pursuit of it alone constitute a sufficient end for education. When this ideal beauty, this flower of harmony and proportion in name, this fair disposition of all his mental and physical parts is attained, man is necessarily happy, because perfect. So the only ill is ignorance, error, lack of experience, and the only good is the right use of reason, whereby all weakness, mental and physical, is fortified, and human nature lifted to the ideal conditions that it thirsts after. H. Harrent is charmed with this picture of old-world academic philosophy, and sees in it the panacea for all the ills and aches of our modern educational systems, however conflicting in scope, aim, principle and method.

Apropos of the contemporary schools of Athens (*Hist. Essays*, III, p. 80), Cardinal Newman touches on this expedient for law, obedience, imposed duty, this "fine taste, exquisite sense of the decorous, the graceful, and the appropriate, the true guide for ordering our mind and our conduct, and bringing the whole man into shape." These are great sophisms, he remarks, whereby the men of Athens believed that "a fine and delicate taste, a sense of honor, and an elevated, aspiring spirit," in other words, true antique gentlemanliness, could take the place of law and conscience. "If beautifulness was all that was needed to make a thing right, then nothing graceful and pleasant could be wrong; and since there is no abstract idea but admits of being embellished and dressed up and made pleasant and graceful, it follows as a matter of course that anything whatever is permissible. One sees at once, that, taking men as they are, the love of the beautiful would be nothing short of the love of the sensual; nor was the anticipation falsified by

the event ; for in Athens genius and voluptuousness ever went hand in hand, and their literature, as it has come down to us, is no sample or measure of their actual mode of living." (Ib. p. 84.)

It is true that men like Chrysostom and Basil and the Gregories visited their schools and learned there to

"mouth grandly the last Greek."

But these scions of great Syro-Roman or Cappadocian families were placed in extraordinary circumstances at a time when public eloquence was a necessary accomplishment, and the usual condition of justice, advancement, or self-protection. They shared with the men of their day that last refuge of Greek patriotism—the pathetic attachment to the literature of Hellas. From this refuge they rightly hoped to bring about the salvation or the restoration of their peculiar cosmopolitan fatherland—that high universal culture, Greek by origin and nature and organ, but everywhere endemic, and like an atmosphere modifying every activity of the human mind.

Such men had Christian mothers, one generation removed from the great martyr-epochs ; they were brought up in and sustained by a Christian discipline of life that touched them at all points, and was far from having lost its archaic vigor. They partook of the sense of victorious superiority over ethnicism that every Christian then could express ; the sufferings from heresy were often scarcely to be distinguished from the old Gentile persecutions. Thus, the Christian students at Athens or Antioch or elsewhere enjoyed peculiar advantages that nullified what might otherwise have been as fatal to them as to Julian and others, for not all escaped untinged from those centres of unbelief and immorality.

Apart from this view-point, the book of M. Harrent is a valuable addition to our knowledge of the academic life of the ancients, and brings out so many unknown or unconsidered details that it may be looked upon as a positive addition to the recognized literature of the subject.

The Meaning of Education and other Essays and Addresses.

Nicholas Murray Butler. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898; pp. xi+230.

This volume brings together seven papers, which, chiefly in the form of addresses, have on various occasions presented the author's opinions concerning education. Four of the addresses deal with the principles of education; the remaining three with the functions, relations and needs of educational institutions. Education, as distinct from mere instruction, means "a gradual adjustment to the spiritual possessions of the race," whereby the child is introduced to his inheritance—scientific, literary, æsthetic, institutional and religious. "The highest and most enduring knowledge is of the things of the spirit. That subtle sense of the beautiful and the sublime which accompanies spiritual insight and is part of it—this is the highest achievement of which humanity is capable."

The scientific study of education, and therefore the preparation of the teacher for his work, must take into consideration the physiological, psychological and sociological aspects of education. The last-named aspect is treated at length under the title "Democracy and Education." The task of education in a country like ours is to develop intelligence and character among the whole people, to prepare them for intelligent citizenship and for a patriotic participation in the interests and government of the community. Such in barest outline is Professor Butler's ideal of education. His work touches on many minor points and conveys numerous suggestions by which every teacher may profit. Practical details as to the adjustment of the college curriculum are given in the papers on the function of the secondary school and the reform of secondary education.

Books Received.

The Month of Our Lady. From the Italian of Dr. Augustine Ferrari, by Rev. John F. Mullany, LL. D.; Benziger Bros., New York, 1898; 8°, pp. 341.

Nochmals der biblische Schoepfungsbericht, von Fr. v. Hummelauer, S. J. (Biblische Studien III. 2.) Herder, Freiburg, 1898; 8°, pp. 132.

Beyond the Grave. From the French of Rev. E. Hamon, S. J., by Anna T. Sadlier; B. Herder, St. Louis, 1898.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

EXERCISES OF GRADUATION.

The graduation exercises took place June 8, at 10 A. M. Besides the officers of the administration and the professors there were present M. Cambon, the Ambassador of France, Herr von Holleben, the Ambassador of Germany, and the Ambassador of the Chinese Empire. Monsignor McMahon, Monsignor Sbarretti, auditor of the Papal Delegation, Very Rev. Dr. Magnien, SS., Director of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, and other distinguished members of the clergy, occupied seats on the platform.

After an address by the Rt. Rev. Rector, Mgr. Conaty, the candidates for degrees were presented by the Deans of their respective faculties. The exercises were closed by a discourse from His Eminence, the Chancellor. After the exercises the audience repaired to the chapel, where the Te Deum was sung and the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament was given.

Conferring Degrees.

The following degrees were publicly conferred upon the successful candidates.

Bachelors in Theology.

Rev. John Francis Donohue, Diocese of Hartford.

Rev. Victor Francis Ducat, Diocese of Detroit.

Rev. James Bernard Hayden, Diocese of Albany.

Rev. William Joseph Higgins, A. B., Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Rev. Charles Francis Kavanagh, Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Rev. Florence Aloysius Lane, A. B., Diocese of Springfield.

Rev. John William McDermott, Diocese of Syracuse.

Rev. Edmund Augustine O'Connor, Diocese of Albany.

Rev. Maurice Joseph O'Connor, A. B., Archdiocese of Boston.

Licentiates in Theology.

Rev. James David O'Neill, Archdiocese of Chicago, Professor of Moral Theology in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. Dissertation: "The Pre-Mosaic Sabbath." *Maxima cum laude.*

Rev. Thomas Francis Burke, C. S. P. Dissertation: "Philosophical Sin." *Maxima cum laude.*

Rev. Bertrand Louis Conway, C. S. P. Dissertation: "The Growth and Nature of Trusts." *Maxima cum laude.*

Rev. Donald James McKinnon, Archdiocese of San Francisco. Dissertation: "The Census of Quirinus." *Maxima cum laude.*

Rev. Jeremiah Francis O'Meara, Diocese of Providence. Dissertation: "The Plenary Infallibility of the Bible." *Maxima cum laude.*

Rev. Martin Francis Reddy, Diocese of Providence. Dissertation: "The Biblical Doctrine of Penance." *Magna cum laude.*

Rev. Paul Patrick Aylward, Archdiocese of Milwaukee. Dissertation: "The Wage-System." *Cum laude.*

Rev. John Brady, Diocese of Los Angeles and Monterey. Dissertation: "The Genuinity of the Gospel of St. Matthew." *Cum laude.*

Rev. John Sylvester Dunn, Diocese of Providence. Dissertation: "The Verbal Inspiration of the Bible." *Cum laude.*

Rev. Andrew Frederick Haberstroh, Archdiocese of Boston. Dissertation: "The Primacy of the Roman See in the Early Fathers." *Cum laude.*

Bachelors of Laws.

Frank Alan Bolton, Litt. B., Newark, Ohio.

John Francis Duane, A. B., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Francis Patrick Guilfoile, A. B., Waterbury, Conn.

Richard Kerens, Jr., A. B., St. Louis, Mo.

John Lawrence Love, A. B., Washington, D. C.

John J. O'Brien, A. B., Wheeling, W. Va.

Owen Wm. Reddy, Attorney-at-Law, Newburyport, Mass.

George Joseph Tuohy, A. B., Norfolk, Va.

Master of Laws.

Charles A. Millener, LL. B., Deseronte, Ont.

Doctor of Civil Law.

William Scott, LL.M., San Antonio, Texas. Dissertation :
"Some Survivals of the Roman Law in the Common Law."

Bachelors of Science.

Joseph Gregory Powers, Central Park, L. I.

Francis de Sales Smith, Washington, D. C.

John Peter Murray, Chicago, Ill.

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

Since the publication of the Year-Book, Dr. Bolling has been appointed Associate Professor of Greek Language and Literature and placed in charge of the work of that department.

The primary object of the department of Greek is to train men for investigations in the Greek language and literature. This is done in the belief that the best work as teachers in colleges and other schools can be accomplished only by men who are at the same time independent investigators in the subjects which they teach. A second object that is never to be lost sight of is the needs of students in the School of Philosophy and in the School of Divinity, who require Greek as an instrument for the prosecution of their studies in these departments. The student of the History of Philosophy and of Church History can accomplish the best results, only when he is in a position to handle with independent judgment the original documents upon which his work is based. The object of the work in this department is to give him the knowledge of the Greek language and of the methods of establishing and interpreting a text that are indispensable for this purpose. With a view to meeting the requirements of both these classes of students the following courses are offered :

The centre of work will be the Greek Seminary which will meet once a week for the minute critical study of some author. During the year 1898-'99, the work will be directed towards the study of the Christian Apologists, and especially of

St. Justin Martyr. The work will consist partly of lectures by the Director of the Seminary, and partly of the interpretation of passages and presentation of papers on topics previously assigned to the students by the Director.

The work of the Seminary will be supplemented by a series of lectures on Greek Syntax as a Norm of Style. During the year 1898-'99, the subject treated of will be the use of the cases.

During the first term there will also be conducted a series of practical exercises in the translation of Greek into English and of English into Greek. For these will be substituted, in the second term, two courses of lectures and of readings, one in the Greek Lyric Poets, the other in the Greek Philosophers before Plato.

Gift of Valuable Manuscripts. Through the generosity of Rev. A. M. J. Hynes, the University has received a manuscript of considerable value, being an account of the diplomatic proceedings in the years 1708 and 1709, between the Roman Curia and the courts of Austria and Spain, relative to the duchies of Parma and Piacenza, and the citadel and territory of Comacchio on the Adriatic. Pope Clement XI had been on the side of Louis XIV in the matter of the Spanish successions (1702-1713). The battle of Turin (1706) blasted the hopes of Philip V, the grandson of Louis, and confirmed the claims of the Austrian Archduke Charles to the title of Charles VI of Spain. One result of the Austrian triumph was the resurrection of old imperial claims to the northern territories of the Roman State, and a general rejection of the mediæval titles of the papacy. This valuable manuscript is a contemporaneous quasi-official account of the public events and documents of those two years, as far as they concern these ancient papal fiefs. The compilation is from the pen of the Abbate Antonio Fiocca, a secretary of Cardinal Bichi, and is dedicated to Mgr. Annibale Albani, nephew of the reigning pope, Clement XI. It contains 352 quarto pages, the last three of which are blank. Pages 335-349 contain an index giving the titles of numerous pontifical, imperial and cardinalitial letters. The manuscript is about six by eight inches, is written on paper bearing as watermark the arms of the Albani, contains no indications of former own-

ers, has lost its original binding, and is written in a fine round legible Italian hand, without many abbreviations. Altogether, it is a good specimen of the clerkly work done by the old Calabrian "aiutante di studio," from the town of Catanzaro.

The other manuscript, from the same generous donor, is a commentary on Aristotle's Physics, written by John Canon (or Canonicus,) an English Franciscan and disciple of Duns Scotus. Canon flourished at Paris and Oxford from 1329 to 1340. In the editio princeps (Padua, 1475) of this work, it is entitled "Quaestiones profundissimé doctoris Johannis Canonici ordinis minoris (um ?) super octo Libris Phisicorum Aristotelis."

The Dictionary of English Biography (VIII, 445) says that in manuscript the commentary is not uncommon, and quotes one of the year 1485. Our copy is from the hand of a certain Joannes de Saxonia, and seems to have been written in the sixth year of the reign of Boniface IX, i. e., in 1394. The last printed edition of this commentary is that of Venice (1516). Canon was a prolific writer, and has left other commentaries on the "Sentences," as well as "Lecturae magistrales" "Questiones disputatae," etc.

Alumni Meeting.—The annual meeting of the Alumni of the University was held May 24. There are now on the rolls one hundred members. After the business meeting, the alumni and the professors of the University partook of a banquet in the refectory of the new dormitory. The officers elected for the ensuing year are: President, Rev. Joseph F. Smith, New York; Secretary, Rev. Charles F. Aiken, Boston; Treasurer, Rev. William A. Fletcher, Baltimore. The meeting next year will be held in New York City.

GIFTS TO THE LIBRARY.

C. J. MURPHY, Esq., Brussels, Belgium. Fac-similes of Royal, Historical, Literary and other Autographs in the Department of Manuscripts of the British Museum. 9 folios.

BUREAU OF ETHNOLOGY. Sixteenth Annual Report.

REV. A. H. WALBURG, Cincinnati, O. German Languages and Literature.

ROYAL SOCIETY OF CANADA. Proceedings, 1896.

THE UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG. A collection of Catalogues, Discourses, Collectanea Friburgensia, and Theses.

G. JOHNSON, Esq., Ottawa. Year-Book of Canada, 1896.

MISS E. ROGERS, Baltimore. Emendations in Aeschylus.

REV. WM. J. KIRBY. Le Socialisme aux Etats-Unis.

THE LICK OBSERVATORY. Observatory Atlas of the Moon. 14 plates.

INSTITUT CATHOLIQUE DE PARIS. A collection of its Bulletin and Year-Books (6 volumes).

G. WIGAND, Esq., Leipsig. M. Tolstopiatow. Recherches Mineralogiques. Moscow, 1893.

V. REV. THOMAS J. SHAHAN. The Literary Digest, 4 volumes. J. Doogan, Manual of Temperance; Calcutta, 1897. E. Costanzi, Il Razionalismo e la Ragione Storica; Siena, 1896.

MR. EDMUND KEAN, Toledo, O. The Irish World, from 1883 to 1896; The New York Freeman's Journal, from 1883 to 1896.

REV. DENIS CASHMAN, Chicago, Ill. The Lancet, from 1878 to 1896, 18 vols.; The British Medical Journal, from 1878 to 1896, 18 vols.; 8 other volumes on medicine.

P. CUDMORE, Esq., Faribault, Minn. Five volumes on history, and five framed pictures representing Irish Monarchs.

BEQUEST OF THE LATE REV. D. E. LYMAN, Baltimore, Md. 664 volumes on Theological Sciences.

MINISTÈRE DE L'INSTRUCTION PUBLIQUE, Paris. Annales du Bureau Central Météorologique, 3 vols. Nouvelles Archives des missions scientifiques, vol. 8. Bulletin du Comité des Travaux historiques et Scientifiques, vol. 1893-'94. Journal des Savants, numbers Juillet, Aout, Septembre et Octobre, 1897.

RT. REV. C. MAES, D.D., Covington, Ky. Short History of the Catechism. Detroit, 1812. S. O. Trudel, Wonderful Discovery in the Book of Job; Philadelphia, 1890. Mgr. T. J. Lamy, Le Monument Chrétien, de Si-Ngan-Fou; Bruxelles, 1897.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION. G. Brown Goode, History of the Smithsonian Institution; Washington, 1897.

NATIONAL PRISON ASSOCIATION. National Prison Association Records. 1887-96, 10 vols.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE. Foreign Relations of the United States, 33 volumes. Diplomatic Correspondence, 1861-68, 19 volumes. One large wall map of the United States and Territories, 1897.

KING RICHARDSON, Esq., Springfield, Mass. E. G. Tenney, Our Elder Brother; Springfield, Mass., 1897.

H. S. CARRUTH, Esq., Boston, Mass. Life and Correspondence of Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, by Kate M. Rowland; New York, 1898.